Coding Theorem and Converse for Abstract Channels with Time Structure and Memory

Martin Mittelbach and Eduard A. Jorswieck, *Senior Member, IEEE*

arXiv:1510.00347v1 [cs.IT] 1 Oct 2015

Abstract

A coding theorem and converse are proved for abstract channels with time structure that contain continuous-time continuous-valued channels and the result by Kadota and Wyner (1972) as special cases. As main contribution the coding theorem is proved for a significantly weaker condition on the channel output memory and without imposing extra measurability requirements to the channel. These improvements are achieved by introducing a suitable characterization of information rate capacity. It is shown that the previously used ψ-mixing condition is quite restrictive, in particular for the important class of Gaussian channels. In fact, it is proved that for Gaussian (e. g., fading or additive noise) channels the ψ-mixing condition is equivalent to finite output memory. Moreover, a weak converse is derived for all stationary channels with time structure. Intersymbol interference as well as input constraints are taken into account in a general and flexible way, including amplitude and average power constraints as special case. Formulated in rigorous mathematical terms complete, explicit, and transparent proofs are presented. As a side product a gap is closed in the proof of Kadota and Wyner regarding a lemma on the monotonicity of some sequence of normalized mutual informations. An operational perspective is taken and an abstract framework is established, which allows to treat discrete- and continuous-time channels with (possibly infinite) memory and arbitrary alphabets simultaneously in a unified way.

Index Terms

Shannon theory, coded information transmission, continuous-time channels, discrete-time channels, channels with memory, infinite memory, general alphabets, coding theorem, weak converse, mixing conditions

The authors are with the Chair for Communications Theory, Communications Laboratory, Dresden University of Technology, Dresden 01062, Germany (e-mail: martin.mittelbach@tu-dresden.de, eduard.jorswieck@tu-dresden.de).

CONTENTS

I Introduction 1

II Model and Preliminaries 3

II.A General Notation 4

II.B Channel Model and Properties, Time Structure 5

II.C Block Codes and Information Transmission 12

II.D Information Rate Capacity 14

III Coding Theorem and Weak Converse 16

III.A Theorems and Proofs 16

III.B On Measurability Requirements 25

IV Output Memory Conditions 27

V Discussion and Summary of Results 32

Appendix 35

A Stationarity and Ergodicity of Measures and Processes 35

B Information Measures for Random Variables with General Alphabet 35

C Tools to Prove Achievability and Converse 40

D Proofs of Lemmas 42

E Examples 48

References 51

I. Introduction

Motivation. Since Shannon started information theory a large number of publications has been devoted to the mathematically rigorous derivation of channel coding theorems. The goal was to develop the classical Shannon theory for communication models of increasing complexity and generality capturing more and more practically relevant situations and phenomena. The complexity of such models is determined, for instance, by the space of symbols allowed for communication and the time structure of the signals, i. e., finite vs. infinite alphabets and discrete vs. continuous time. Furthermore, complexity is increased by taking technical constraints, e. g., for the transmit signals, into account or by incorporating aspects such as intersymbol interference or memory effects of the random noise process which disturbs the transmission.

A main motivation for this paper is to establish an abstract and unifying framework, that allows us to formulate a general coding theorem for a point-to-point communication link in a mathematically rigorous way under practically useful assumptions. A central objective is to include general continuous-time continuous-valued transmission models because much less attention is payed to this case compared to discrete models. Moreover, the goal is a reduction to the essential channel properties required to prove the coding statements, particularly including conditions for infinite memory. In the literature different regularity conditions are considered when coding results are generalized, where some of the conditions are difficult to verify in practical situations, however, after detailed analysis it turns out they are superfluous, e. g., concerning the measurability of the channel transition probabilities. As can be read in Ahlswede's lecture notes [1, p. 323] "It therefore seems that a thorough investigation 'of the regularity conditions' needed for extending Shannon's coding theory to the continuous case should not only be of interest for the mathematician in his ivory tower, but also to the communication engineer".

Contribution and related work. The main contribution of this paper is a generalization of a coding theorem and a converse of Kadota and Wyner [2] with regard to channel model, input constraints, definition of information rate capacity, and, most notably, w. r. t. required channel properties. Kadota and Wyner considered a continuous-time channel with real-valued input and output signals, whereas we consider channels with time structure in general, i. e., discrete- as well as continuous-time channels with completely arbitrary alphabets. With respect to output memory we achieve a significant generalization. Kadota and Wyner used a property they called asymptotic output-memorylessness, which is introduced later as ψ-mixing condition. We show that this condition is quite restrictive, in particular for the important class of Gaussian channels. Actually, we prove that for Gaussian channels the ψ-mixing condition is equivalent to finite output memory. As a result, Kadota and Wyners's formulation of the coding theorem

is for example not applicable to the important stationary additive Gaussian noise channel with proper rational noise spectral density. By introducing an alternative characterization of information rate capacity we are able to prove the coding theorem under a significantly weaker condition called total ergodicity w. r. t. finite alphabet block-memoryless input sources. Due to the employed definition of capacity we also have the advantage, that we can use a measurability condition, which is implied by channel properties required anyway to prove the coding theorem.

We prove a weak converse for all stationary channels with time structure. No further restrictions on the channel properties or alphabets are required. Due to a generic characterization we have a convenient flexibility in taking intersymbol interference into account. Furthermore, input constraints are incorporated in an abstract form. In contrast to [2], we are able to accomplish this without using a standard extension of the channel input σ-algebra. Outer measures as in [3] can also be avoided due to the modified measurability condition, both making derivations more transparent. We also close a gap in the proof in [2] regarding a lemma on the monotonicity of some sequence of normalized mutual informations. The results are obtained in a general framework by a suitable and consistent combination of various classical tools such as Feinstein's lemma or Pinsker's ergodic theorem of information theory.

Classical works on coding theorems and converse theorems for discrete-time finite alphabet channels with memory are due to Khinchin [4, Part II], Takano [5], Feinstein [6], Wolfowitz [7], Adler [8], Pfaffelhuber [9], and Gray and Ornstein [10]. Extensions to discrete-time channels with continuous or abstract alphabets were derived by Rosenblatt-Roth [11], [12], Jacobs [13], Wagner [14], Augustin [15], Kemperman [16], Dobrushin [17], [18] and Ding [19], [20]. A general formula for the coding capacity of a discrete-time channel, including nonstationary and information unstable channels with abstract alphabets, is given by Verdú and Han [21]. The classical information-theoretic work on continuous-time transmission models is devoted to the additive Gaussian noise channel. The main objective was to give rigorous derivations of and operational significance to Shannon's celebrated capacity formula "$W\log(1+P/NW)$", heuristically derived in [22, Part IV]. Contributions in this direction are due to Ash [23], [24], Yoshihara [25], Wyner [26], [27], Holsinger [28], Gallager [29, Ch. 8], Cordaro and Wagner [30], Baker [31], [32], [33], [34], McKeague [35], and Baker and Ihara [36]. Ihara [37], [38] extended the results by taking feedback into account. The theorems in this paper apply to general continuous-time channel models whereas the previously listed literature is restricted to additive noise or additive Gaussian noise channels. Note that many authors use the method proposed by Holsinger [28] and Gallager [29, Ch. 8], where a continuous-time channel is represented by an infinite series of parallel discrete-time channels. Using a consequent measure-theoretic description and following the approach in [2] we are able to avoid this transformation

completely. Therefore, we can treat discrete- and continuous-time channels with abstract alphabets in a unified way, which we believe is an important argument in favor of the path taken in this paper.

In more recent work on continuous-time channels Charalambous [39] is concerned with the control of continuous-time linear Gaussian systems over wireless fading channels with additive white noise. Weissman [40] studied mismatched estimation in continuous-time additive white Gaussian noise channels and characterized in [41] the capacity of a class of input memoryless continuous-time channels with feedback via directed information. The identification capacity of continuous-time Poisson and Gaussian channels is analyzed by Burnashev [42]. Durisi et al. [43] derived bounds on the noncoherent information capacity of continuous-time underspread wide-sense stationary uncorrelated scattering channels that are selective both in time and frequency. For those channels Durisi et al. [44] characterized the sensitivity of the capacity w. r. t. to the channel model. Furthermore, Jung [45] established a capacity formula for continuous-time doubly-dispersive channels with additive Gaussian noise. Koch and Lapidoth [46, p. 5946] and Durisi et al. [44, p. 6376] raised the question whether a coding theorem does exist for the information capacity expressions they are studying. The paper at hand provides a general framework to analyze this problem for the discrete- as well as the continuous-time fading channel considered there. How this can be done is demonstrated in [3, Par. 17.6], where for some multipath fading channels with infinite input memory, i. e., with an infinite number of path, all channel properties required in the coding theorem of this paper, have been verified. Therewith we have positive examples in the case of [46, p. 5946]. The derivations in [3, Par. 17.6] are also useful as guideline to investigate the continuous-time channels in [44] in this regard.

II. Model and Preliminaries

In this section, we provide the material required to formulate a coding theorem and a weak converse for abstract channels with time structure. We introduce a general stochastic transmission and communication model including relevant properties as well as an adequate form of information rate capacity. To allow a self-contained exposition, material on general information-theoretic measures and tools required to prove the central results of this paper is provided in Appendix B and C in tailored form. We begin the section by establishing some general notation used throughout the paper. Basic notions of probability and measure theory are used freely. As a compact reference in this regard please refer to [47, Chs. 1–4, 6], where the notation is close to that introduced below. A compact collection of more advanced and frequently used background material from probability and measure theory (e. g., on Markov kernels and chains, densities of measures, Fubini's theorem, characterizations of ergodicity, etc.) is given in [3, Appendix A and B].

II.A. General Notation

Sets, σ-algebras, (product) measurable spaces and functions. As usual $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{N}_0$, and $\mathbb{R}$ denote the set of integers, positive integers, nonnegative integers, and real numbers, respectively. Throughout this paper we denote by T the set of time indices. Whenever the index set T is used it can be replaced either by $\mathbb{Z}$ to model discrete-time or by $\mathbb{R}$ to model continuous-time. Occasionally, it is convenient to extend T and consider $\overline{T} = T \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$. The sets of positive and nonnegative time indices are denoted by T_+ and T_0, respectively. In case of $T = \mathbb{Z}$ we use the interval notation for subsets of T to denote the set of consecutive integers contained in the interval, e. g., if $v \in T_+$, then $(0, v]$ is the short hand version of $\{1, 2, \ldots, v\}$. We write $\varnothing$ for the empty set. For a set A we denote by A^{c} its complement and by 2^A its power set, i. e., the set of all subsets of A.

A pair $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ consisting of a space Ω and a σ-algebra $\mathcal{F}$ on Ω is called measurable space. A partition of $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ is any countable family $\{A_1, A_2, \ldots\}$ of disjoint sets $A_i \in \mathcal{F}$ whose union is equal to Ω. If $\mathcal{G}$ is a family of subsets of Ω, then $\sigma(\mathcal{G})$ denotes the smallest σ-algebra containing $\mathcal{G}$. Suppose $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ and $(X, \mathcal{X})$ are measurable spaces and f is a function on Ω with values in X. If f is measurable w. r. t. the σ-algebras $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{X}$, i. e., $\{f^{-1}(A) : A \in \mathcal{X}\} \subset \mathcal{F}$, then we say f is $\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{X}$-measurable. In the special case where f is a real-valued or numerical function, i. e., $X = \mathbb{R}$ or $X = \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ and $\mathcal{X}$ is the corresponding Borel-σ-algebra, then we simply say f is $\mathcal{F}$-measurable.

Assume that $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$ are measurable spaces. Then $(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}_2)$ denotes the corresponding product measurable space consisting of the product space $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$ and the product σ-algebra $\mathcal{F}_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}_2$.

Probability and measure spaces, random variables. The triple $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ consisting of the space Ω, the σ-algebra $\mathcal{F}$, and the measure μ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ is called measure space. If μ is a probability measure, then $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ is called probability space. Suppose ν is another measure on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$. Then we write $\mu \ll \nu$ if μ is absolutely continuous w. r. t. ν, i. e., if every ν-nullset is a μ-nullset. By δ_ω we denote the Dirac measure on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ concentrated at some $\omega \in \Omega$. If $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{F}_1, \mu_1)$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, \mu_2)$ are two measure spaces, then $\mu_1 \otimes \mu_2$ denotes the product measure obtained from μ_1 and μ_2, which is defined on the product measurable space $(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}_2)$

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathrm{P})$ be a probability space. For a random variable ξ defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathrm{P})$ we denote by P_ξ the distribution of ξ. If ξ has values in the measurable space $(X, \mathcal{X})$, then X is called alphabet of the random variable ξ. If $\{\xi_t, t \in T\}$ is a family of random variables, where ξ_t has values in $(X_t, \mathcal{X}_t)$ and $(X_t, \mathcal{X}_t) = (X_0, \mathcal{X}_0)$ for all $t \in T$, then X_0 is also called alphabet of the family. For any set $F \in \mathcal{F}$

and σ-algebra $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{F}$ we denote by $\mathrm{P}(F\,|\,\mathcal{A})$ the conditional probability of F given $\mathcal{A}$. If η is a another random variable on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathrm{P})$ with values in Y and $A \in \mathcal{X}$, then $\mathrm{P}_{\xi|\eta}(A\,|\,\cdot)$ denotes the conditional probability of $\{\xi \in A\}$ given η, which is a nonnegative random variable on $(Y, \mathcal{Y}, \mathrm{P}_\eta)$. If ξ and η and a third random variable ζ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathrm{P})$ form a Markov chain in this order, then we write $(\xi - \eta - \zeta)$. If ξ and η are real or numerical random variables, then $\mathrm{cor}(\xi, \eta)$ is the (normalized) correlation of ξ and η.

Logarithms. If we write $\log$, then we always assume logarithms w. r. t. base e. In addition, we always suppose $0 \log \frac{0}{x} = 0$ for $x \geq 0$ and $x \log \frac{x}{0} = +\infty$ for $x > 0$.

II.B. Channel Model and Properties, Time Structure

Starting with a completely general stochastic transmission model – the channel – we introduce time structure by considering Cartesian products as channel input and output spaces. We introduce an abstract model to specify constraints on the channel input signals, define channel properties directly relevant in connection with proving a coding theorem and converse, and give useful related implications.

(2.1) Definition (Channel). Let X be an arbitrary set and $(Y, \mathcal{Y})$ be an arbitrary measurable space. Assume that κ is a function on $X \times \mathcal{Y}$ with values in $[0, 1]$ such that $\kappa(x, \cdot)$ is a probability measure on $(Y, \mathcal{Y})$ for all $x \in X$. Then κ is called a channel with input space X and output measurable space $(Y, \mathcal{Y})$.

(2.2) Remark (Interpretation, measurability, input-output measure). The interpretation of the definition is as follows: The quantity $\kappa(x, B)$ specifies the probability that the received symbol lies in the set $B \in \mathcal{Y}$ given the transmitted symbol was $x \in X$.

In the literature, the definition of an abstract channel typically includes a σ-algebra $\mathcal{X}$ on the input space X and it is required that $\kappa(\cdot, B)$ is an $\mathcal{X}$-measurable function for all $B \in \mathcal{Y}$. With this additional technical condition κ is a Markov kernel from $(X, \mathcal{X})$ to $(Y, \mathcal{Y})$, which is the mathematical model used, e. g., in [48, Sec. 1.5][1], [50, Sec. 6.2], [2], [51, Sec. 3.1], or [52, Sec. 2.2] and also in [3]. For the model of a discrete-time memoryless channel Ahlswede pointed out in [1, Sec. 6.1] that the measurability condition can be omitted when coding problems are studied, as was already demonstrated in [15, p. 11]. Also [16] and [53] considered the discrete-time memoryless case without requiring measurability. Subsequently, we show that an additional measurability condition as mentioned above is also not needed for the general coding result of this paper, where abstract channels with discrete or continuous time structure and (infinite)

[1] Russian original, see [18, Sec. 1.5] for English and [49, Sec. 1.5] for German translation.

memory are considered. Rather, the type of measurability merely required is shown to be automatically satisfied for the channel properties needed anyway to prove the coding theorem. This simplification is of significant practical interest because measurability in the previously described sense may not be given or hard to verify in relevant applications. The measurability aspect of the channel is discussed in more detail in Section III.B.

In the derivations below we often consider a subset $A \subset X$ of the channel input space together with a σ-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ on A such that $\kappa(\cdot, G)$ as function on A is $\mathcal{A}$-measurable for all $G \in \mathcal{G}$, where $\mathcal{G}$ is a semiring generating $\mathcal{Y}$, i. e., $\mathcal{Y} = \sigma(\mathcal{G})$. Due to the measurability we can induce with a probability measure μ on $(A, \mathcal{A})$ the function

$$\mu\kappa(F \times G) = \int_F \kappa(x, G)\, \mathrm{d}\mu(x), \tag{1}$$

on the set $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{G} = \{F \times G : F \in \mathcal{A},\, G \in \mathcal{G}\}$ of rectangles. Since $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{G}$ is a semiring generating the product σ-algebra $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{Y}$ this pre-measure can be extended in exactly one way to a probability measure $\mu\kappa$ on the product space $(A \times Y, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{Y})$. We call μ (channel) input probability measure and $\mu\kappa$ (channel) input-output probability measure. The marginal measure of $\mu\kappa$ on $\mathcal{Y}$ given by $\nu(B) = \mu\kappa(A \times B)$ for all $B \in \mathcal{Y}$ is called output probability measure.

(2.3) Time structure, inverse images, shifts. Let $\{X_t, t \in T\}$ be a family of sets with $X_t = X_0$ for all $t \in T$. For $u \le v \in \overline{T}$ we denote the product space generated by the subfamily related to the index set $(u, v]$ by[2]

$$X_u^v = \bigtimes_{t \in (u,v]} X_t. \tag{2}$$

With $x_u^v = \{x_t, t \in (u, v]\}$, where $x_t \in X_t$ we denote an element of X_u^v. As short hand notation we use X, X_-^v, and X_u^+ for $X_{-\infty}^{\infty}$, $X_{-\infty}^v$, and X_u^{∞}, respectively. The same convention applies to x_u^v.

For the inverse image of a set $A \subset X_u^v$ w. r. t. the projection from X onto X_u^v we write

$$[A] = \{x \in X : x_u^v \in A\}.$$

We naturally extend this notation to a family $\mathcal{A}$ of subsets of X_u^v on an element-by-element basis, i. e.,

$$[\mathcal{A}] = \big\{[A] : A \in \mathcal{A}\big\}.$$

[2] Considered as subset of T the index set $(u, v]$ denotes an half-open interval if $u < v < \infty$, the open interval (u, ∞) if $u < v = \infty$, the set $\{v\}$ if $u = v \neq \pm\infty$, and the empty set $\varnothing$ otherwise.

The w-shifted version of an element $x_u^v = \{x_t, t \in (u,v]\} \in X_u^v$ for some $w \in T$, denoted by $\langle x_u^v \rangle_w$, is an element of X_{u+w}^{v+w} given by

$$\langle x_u^v \rangle_w = \big\{\tilde{x}_s, s \in (u+w, v+w]\big\}, \qquad \tilde{x}_s = x_{s-w}.$$

We naturally extend this notation on an element-by-element basis to a set $A \subset X_u^v$ and a family $\mathcal{A}$ of subsets of X_u^v to obtain the w-shifted versions $\langle A \rangle_w \subset X_{u+w}^{v+w}$ and $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_w$. Additionally, if $\mathcal{A}$ is a σ-algebra on A, then the w-shifted copy $\langle \mu \rangle_w$ of a measure μ on $(A, \mathcal{A})$ is a measure on $(\langle A \rangle_w, \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_w)$ defined by

$$\langle \mu \rangle_w(F) = \mu\big(\langle F \rangle_{-w}\big)$$

for any $F \in \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_w$. Using the shift operator $\langle \cdot \rangle_w$ allows us to emphasize the position on the time axis T.

A set $A \subset X$ is called w-invariant if

$$A = \langle A \rangle_w = \big\{\langle x \rangle_w : x \in X\big\}$$

holds. It is called (shift-) invariant, if it is w-invariant for all $w \in T$.

Further, we consider the family $\{(Y_t, \mathcal{Y}_t), t \in T\}$ of measurable spaces with $(Y_t, \mathcal{Y}_t) = (Y_0, \mathcal{Y}_0)$ for all $t \in T$ and the corresponding product space and product σ-algebra

$$Y_u^v = \bigtimes_{t \in (u,v]} Y_t, \qquad \mathcal{Y}_u^v = \bigotimes_{t \in (u,v]} \mathcal{Y}_t,$$

generated by the subfamilies related to the index set[2] $(u,v]$. The notation introduced above for product spaces applies in an analog manner. For any $t \in T$ let η_t be a random variable on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathrm{P})$ with values in $(Y_t, \mathcal{Y}_t)$. Then η_u^v denotes the random variable on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathrm{P})$ with values in $(Y_u^v, \mathcal{Y}_u^v)$, which is defined for any $\omega \in \Omega$ by

$$\eta_u^v(\omega) = \big\{\eta_t(\omega), t \in (u,v]\big\}.$$

We identify η_u^v with the family $\{\eta_t, t \in (u,v]\}$ of random variables, which is (a segment of) a random process either with discrete time (i. e., a random vector or sequence) or continuous time. As short hand notation we also use η, η_-^v, and η_u^+ instead of $\eta_{-\infty}^{\infty}$, $\eta_{-\infty}^v$, and η_u^{∞}.

We further define the family

$$\mathfrak{C}_Y = \Big\{[F] \subset Y : F \in \mathcal{Y}_u^v \text{ for some } u \le v \in T\Big\}, \tag{3}$$

which is an algebra and therefore in particular a semiring generating $\mathcal{Y}$, i. e., $\mathcal{Y} = \sigma(\mathfrak{C}_Y)$.

(2.4) Definition (Channel with time structure). A channel κ with input product space X and output product measurable space $(Y, \mathcal{Y})$ as introduced in Paragraph 2.3 is called a channel with time structure. If we have $T = \mathbb{Z}$ for the time index set, then κ is called discrete-time channel and if $T = \mathbb{R}$, then κ is called continuous-time channel. Elements of X and Y or of corresponding sub-product spaces are called input and output (time) signals, respectively. The space X_0 and the measurable space Y_0 are called input and output alphabet.

In the rest of the paper, κ is a channel with time structure with input product space X and output product measurable space $(Y, \mathcal{Y})$. The notation introduced in Paragraph 2.3 is used freely. It is used in an analog manner for other product spaces.

(2.5) Input constraints. Usually signals used for information transmission have to meet certain constraints that result for example from technical specifications. For a transmission of duration $s \in T_+$ starting at time 0, we model such constraints in an abstract way by a set $E_s \subset X_0^s$, i. e., a subset of all possible input signals in the time period $(0, s]$. From E_s we build the set

$$E_s^* = \bigtimes_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \langle E_s\rangle_{ks} \subset X \tag{4}$$

of all signals in X that satisfy the input constraint in any time period $(ks, (k+1)s]$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. A signal from E_s^* represents a sequence of transmissions, each of duration s and satisfying the input constraint. In cases of practical importance the set E_s contains the null-signal such that we can represent a transmission of finite duration also by a signal from E_s^*. The union of all time-shifted versions of E_s^* is the shift-invariant set

$$E_s' = \bigcup_{t\in(0,s]} \langle E_s^*\rangle_t. \tag{5}$$

Assume now that we have a constraint set for any time duration, i. e., suppose we have the family $\mathcal{E} = \{E_s \subset X_0^s, s \in T_+\}$ of sets. Subsequently, we make use of the shift-invariant set

$$E' = \bigcup_{s\in T_+} E_s' \tag{6}$$

with E_s' as in (5). We are especially interested in families $\mathcal{E}$ of constraint sets, that satisfy the following regularity condition

$$\bigtimes_{k=0}^{n-1} \big\langle E_s\big\rangle_{ks} \subset E_{ns} \tag{7}$$

for any $s \in T_+$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This condition is important, for example, in the coding theorem (and converse) for channels with time structure. A useful sufficient condition for (7) is that

$$E_u \times \left\langle E_v \right\rangle_u \subset E_{u+v} \tag{8}$$

holds for all $u, v \in T_+$.

In Paragraph E.1 of Appendix E the prominent amplitude and average power constraint are considered in the defined abstract context as important examples. It is shown that both are satisfying condition (8).

(2.6) Measurability conditions, discrete memoryless input measures. We consider the family $\mathcal{E} = \{E_s \subset X_0^s, s \in T_+\}$ of input constraints introduced in Paragraph 2.5 and define the sets

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{A}(E_s) = \Bigg\{ \Big(\bigtimes_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} A_k, \bigotimes_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{A}_k \Big) : A_0 = \{\mathtt{a}_{[1]}, \mathtt{a}_{[2]}, \ldots, \mathtt{a}_{[\mathtt{m}]}\} \subset E_s,\ A_k = \langle A_0 \rangle_{ks},\\ \mathcal{A}_0 = 2^{A_0},\ \mathcal{A}_k = \langle \mathcal{A}_0 \rangle_{ks} \Bigg\},\\ \mathfrak{A}(\mathcal{E}) = \bigcup_{s\in T_+} \mathfrak{A}(E_s).\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Thus $(A, \mathcal{A}) \in \mathfrak{A}(E_s)$ is a product measurable space with $A \subset E_s^* \subset X$ that is build from shifted copies of $(A_0, \mathcal{A}_0)$, where $A_0 \subset E_s \subset X_0^s$ contains finitely many signals in the time period $(0, s]$ satisfying the input constraint E_s and $\mathcal{A}_0$ is the corresponding power set of A_0. We say the channel κ satisfies the measurability condition

(M) w. r. t. $\mathcal{E}$, if for all $(A, \mathcal{A}) \in \mathfrak{A}(\mathcal{E})$ and $G \in \mathfrak{C}_{_Y}$ it holds that $\kappa(\cdot, G)$ as function on A is $\mathcal{A}$-measurable, where the set $\mathfrak{C}_{_Y}$ is defined in (3).

The condition (M) fits to the measurability requirements in the proof of the coding theorem and converse below. In particular, it allows to generate in a well-defined way the probability measure $\mu\kappa$ on $(A \times Y, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{Y})$ according to (1) using the channel κ and a probability measure μ on $(A, \mathcal{A}) \in \mathfrak{A}(\mathcal{E})$, where we take $\mathfrak{C}_{_Y}$ as semiring. As will be shown in Lemma 2.8 the condition (M) is automatically satisfied for the channel properties needed anyway to prove the coding theorem. The measurability aspect of the channel is discussed in more detail in Section III.B, in particular with regard to the commonly considered assumptions in literature.

Subsequently, we are dealing with channel input probability measures of the following form. We define

the sets of product probability measures

$$\mathcal{P}(E_s) = \Big\{ \bigotimes_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \mu_k : \mu_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i \delta_{\mathtt{a}_{[\mathtt{i}]}},\ \mathtt{a}_{[\mathtt{i}]} \in E_s,\ p_i > 0,\ \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i = 1,\ \mu_k = \langle \mu_0 \rangle_{ks} \Big\}, \tag{10}$$

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}) = \bigcup_{s\in T_+} \mathcal{P}(E_s), \tag{11}$$

where $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E_s)$ is considered as measure on the product space $(A, \mathcal{A}) \in \mathfrak{A}(E_s)$ build from $A_0 = \{\mathtt{a}_{[\mathtt{1}]}, \dots, \mathtt{a}_{[\mathtt{m}]}\} \subset E_s$ as in (9). By $\delta_{\mathtt{a}_{[\mathtt{i}]}}$ we denote the Dirac measure on $(A_0, \mathcal{A}_0)$ for the signal $\mathtt{a}_{[\mathtt{i}]} \in A_0$. Further, we define the corresponding sets of probability spaces

$$\mathfrak{P}(E_s) = \Big\{ (A, \mathcal{A}, \mu) : (A, \mathcal{A}) \in \mathfrak{A}(E_s),\ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(E_s) \Big\}, \tag{12}$$

$$\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{E}) = \bigcup_{s\in T_+} \mathfrak{P}(E_s). \tag{13}$$

We say a probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E_s)$ is s-memoryless since w. r. t. the partitioned time axis into segments $(ks, (k+1)s]$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, it represents a memoryless source. The alphabet of the source μ is finite and its elements satisfy the input constraint E_s. We call $\mathcal{P}(E_s)$ also the set of finite alphabet block-memoryless sources satisfying the constraints $\mathcal{E}$.

In the rest of the paper, $\mathcal{E} = \{E_s \subset X_0^s, s \in T_+\}$ denotes a family of input constraints and the notation introduced in Paragraphs 2.5 and 2.6 is used freely.

(2.7) Definition (Channel properties: Stationarity, ergodicity, causality, asymptotic input-memorylessness).

(i) *Stationarity.* Given $s \in T$, the channel κ is called s-stationary, if for any $x \in X$ and $B \in \mathcal{Y}$

$$\kappa(x, B) = \kappa\big(\langle x \rangle_s, \langle B \rangle_s\big)$$

holds. It is called stationary, if it is s-stationary for all $s \in T$.

(ii) *Ergodicity.* Assume the channel κ satisfies the measurability condition (M) w. r. t. the family $\mathcal{E} = \{E_s \subset X_0^s, s \in T_+\}$ of input constraints. For $s \in T_+$, an s-stationary channel κ is called s-ergodic w. r. t. $\mathfrak{P}(E_s)$, if for any channel input probability space $(A, \mathcal{A}, \mu) \in \mathfrak{P}(E_s)$ the induced channel input-output probability measure $\mu\kappa$ on $(A \times Y, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{Y})$ is s-stationary and s-ergodic (see Definition A.1 in Appendix A). A stationary channel κ is called totally ergodic w. r. t. $\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{E})$, if for all $s \in T_+$ it is s-ergodic w. r. t. $\mathfrak{P}(E_s)$.

(iii) *Causality.* The channel κ is called causal if for any $t \in T$, $B \in \mathcal{Y}_-^t$, and $x, \tilde{x} \in X$ coinciding on $(-\infty, t]$ we have

$$\kappa(x, [B]) = \kappa(\tilde{x}, [B]).$$

(iv) *Finite input memory.* The channel κ has finite input memory if for all $s \in T$ there exists a $t_{\scriptscriptstyle I}(s) \in T_0$ such that for all $B \in \mathcal{Y}_s^+$ and $x, \tilde{x} \in X$ coinciding on $(s - t_{\scriptscriptstyle I}(s), \infty)$ we have

$$\kappa(x, [B]) = \kappa(\tilde{x}, [B]).$$

For given $s \in T$ we call the smallest possible $t_{\scriptscriptstyle I}(s)$ the input memory length at time s. If $t_{\scriptscriptstyle I}(s) = 0$ for all $s \in T$, then we say the channel is input-memoryless.

(v) *Asymptotic input-memorylessness.* The channel κ is called asymptotically input-memoryless for the input signal set $X' \subset X$ if for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $s \in T$ there exists a $t_{\scriptscriptstyle I}(\epsilon, s) \in T_0$ such that for any $B \in \mathcal{Y}_s^+$ and $x, \tilde{x} \in X'$ coinciding on $(s - t_{\scriptscriptstyle I}(\epsilon, s), \infty)$ we have

$$\big|\kappa(x, [B]) - \kappa(\tilde{x}, [B])\big| < \epsilon.$$

Due to the next lemma we can omit an extra measurability requirement in the channel model to prove the general coding theorem of this paper. The proof is given in Paragraph D.1 of Appendix D.

(2.8) Lemma (*Causal asymptotically input-memoryless channels satisfy (M)). If the channel κ is causal and asymptotically input-memoryless for the signal set $E' \subset X$ defined in (6) based on the family $\mathcal{E} = \{E_s \subset X_0^s, s \in T_+\}$ of input constraints, then κ satisfies the measurability condition (M) w. r. t. $\mathcal{E}$.*

The proof of the next lemma is given, e. g., in [52, p. 25] or [51, p. 124] for the case $T = \mathbb{Z}$. There is actually no difference in the derivations for $T = \mathbb{R}$.

(2.9) Lemma (*Stationarity of induced input-output probability measure). Let $(A, \mathcal{A})$ with $A \subset X$ be a measurable space and assume that $\kappa(\cdot, G)$ as function on A is $\mathcal{A}$-measurable for all sets $G \in \mathfrak{C}_{\scriptscriptstyle Y}$. If κ is an s-stationary (stationary) channel and μ is an s-stationary (stationary) channel input probability measure on $(A, \mathcal{A})$, then the induced input-output probability measure $\mu\kappa$ as defined by (1) and the corresponding output probability measure ν are s-stationary (stationary) (see Definition A.1).*

II.C. Block Codes and Information Transmission

For channels with time structure as defined in Definition 2.4 we introduce quantities relevant in connection with channel coding, such as block code, code rate, decoding error etc. The effect of channel input memory (also infinite) representing the potential impact of previously transmitted signals (codewords) on the current transmission is taken into account as well as possible restrictions on the signals allowed to send over the channel. Then we explain how a code is used in a communication system to transmit information, in particular to point out, that we consider codes that allow the repeated transmission of messages with the same reliability.

(2.10) Definition (Block code with input constraint, code parameters). Suppose the quantities $b \in T_+$, $E_b \subset X_0^b$, and $W = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ are given. Let $u_i \in E_b$, $i \in W$, be pairwise distinct and let $B_i \in \mathcal{Y}_0^b$, $i \in W$, form a partition[3] of Y_0^b. Then

$$\mathcal{C}(b, E_b) = \big\{(u_i, B_i), i \in W\big\}$$

is called a (channel) block code for the message set W satisfying the input constraint E_b, where u_i is called codeword and B_i decoding set for message $i \in W$. The code rate of $\mathcal{C}(b, E_b)$ is defined by

$$R_{\mathcal{C}} = \frac{1}{b} \log m,$$

where $m = |\mathcal{C}(b, E_b)|$ denotes the code size and b the block length of $\mathcal{C}(b, E_b)$.

(2.11) Definition (Decoding error probability, (b, E_b, V, M, ϵ)-code). Let $\mathcal{C}(b, E_b)$ be a block code as in Definition 2.10 and let

$$U_b^* = \bigtimes_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \big\langle \{u_i, i \in W\} \big\rangle_{kb} \tag{14}$$

be the set of all two-sided sequences of codewords. Suppose V is a b-invariant set satisfying $U_b^* \subset V \subset X$ and assume that the channel κ is b-stationary. The decoding error probability $\varrho(u_i, V)$ for codeword u_i w. r. t. the set V is defined by

$$\varrho(u_i, V) = \sup_{x \in [u_i] \cap V} \kappa(x, [B_i^{\mathrm{c}}]),$$

[3]Assuming disjointness is essential here but the decoding sets do not have to fill up the whole space Y_0^b. However, the assumption is convenient and for our purposes it can always be established by merging the remaining part of Y_0^b with one of the sets B_i.

where B_i is the decoding set corresponding to u_i. The (maximal) decoding error probability $\varrho_{\max}(V)$ of $\mathcal{C}(b, E_b)$ is defined by

$$\varrho_{\max}(V) = \max_{i \in W} \varrho(u_i, V), \tag{15}$$

where W denotes the finite message set. The code $\mathcal{C}(b, E_b)$ is called a (b, E_b, V, M, ϵ)-code if

$$|\mathcal{C}(b, E_b)| \geq M \qquad \text{and} \qquad \varrho_{\max}(V) \leq \epsilon.$$

(2.12) Coding and decoding. A block code $\mathcal{C}(b, E_b)$ is used in the following way to communicate messages from a set W over a channel κ with time structure. Let the operation start at time 0. To transmit message $i \in W$, codeword u_i is sent within the time period $(0, b]$. If the received signal v within the same time period lies in the decoding set B_j, then v is decoded as message j. To transmit a sequence $(i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_n) \in W^n$ of n messages, the described coding-decoding rule is applied n times in succession. To transmit the kth message in the sequence, the time-shifted version $\langle u_{i_k} \rangle_{(k-1)b}$ of the codeword u_{i_k} is sent within the time period $((k-1)b, kb]$. If the received signal v within $((k-1)b, kb]$ lies in the time-shifted version $\langle B_j \rangle_{(k-1)b}$ of the decoding set B_j, then v is decoded as message j. This message is then an estimate of i_k. The process of transmitting n messages ends at time nb.

Figure 1 illustrates the coding-decoding process for a continuous-time channel with real input and output signals. The messages $2, 1, m, \ldots$ are encoded into the real functions $u_2, u_1, u_m, \ldots$ of duration b taken from the set of codewords. The decoder identifies in each time interval of length b the decoding set containing the received noisy signal, which is represented as a dot in the output space. In the example, the second message in the sequence is incorrectly decoded.

The code size $|\mathcal{C}(b, E_b)|$ is the number of different messages that can be communicated at most with the code. The block length b specifies the time duration of transmitting a single message. The set E_b represents the constraints imposed on the codewords as described in Paragraph 2.5. The code rate $R_{\mathcal{C}}$ characterizes the speed of transmission in [nat/channel use] if $T = \mathbb{Z}$ or in [nat/second] if $T = \mathbb{R}$.

For any $t \in T$ let V_-^t and V_t^+ denote the images of the set V w. r. t. the projections from X onto X_-^t and to X_t^+, respectively. Then $\varrho(u_i, V)$ is the probability that codeword u_i — a signal in the time period $(0, b]$ — is not decoded as message i, no matter what signal from the set V_-^0 has been sent before and from the set V_b^+ has been sent afterwards. The assumption of a b-stationary channel κ and a b-invariant set V implies that $\varrho(u_i, V)$ is also equal to the probability that the shifted codeword $\langle u_i \rangle_{kb}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, is incorrectly decoded, regardless of past signals from the set V_-^{kb} or future signals from the set $V_{(k+1)b}^+$.



Fig. 1. Illustration of coded information transmission.

That means $\varrho(u_i, V)$ is the decoding error probability w. r. t. V for codeword u_i and for any version of u_i shifted by a multiple of the block length b. The maximum of this decoding error probability over all codewords of $\mathcal{C}(b, E_b)$ is represented by $\varrho_{\max}(V)$. Subsequently, we restrict ourselves to situations, where we have the described shift-invariance of the decoding error. The introduced decoding error probability is based on [2, eq. (3)] and [10, eq. (2)]. It is defined in a worst case sense over the possible past and future input history.

We require the set V to contain the set U_b^* of all sequences of codewords to make the decoding error at least robust w. r. t. past and future transmissions of codewords. Since it might be of interest to have robustness not only w. r. t. codewords, the definition allows to consider also larger sets of signals. As a typical example consider the set $E_b^* = \times_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \left\langle E_b \right\rangle_{kb} \supset U_b^*$ already introduced in (4). For a transmission over time it is physically meaningful to assume the channel to be causal. Then the decoding error does only depend on past but not future inputs.

II.D. Information Rate Capacity

We define the information rate capacity of a channel κ with time structure as introduced in Definition 2.4 for the family $\mathcal{E} = \{E_s \subset X_0^s, s \in T_+\}$ of input constraints.

(2.13) Definition (Information rate capacity). If the channel κ satisfies the measurability condition (M) w. r. t. to $\mathcal{E}$, then the information rate capacity of κ for the constraints $\mathcal{E}$ is defined by

$$C = \limsup_{s\to\infty} \frac{1}{s} C_s \qquad \text{with} \qquad C_s = \sup_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(E_s)} I\big(\xi_0^s; \eta_0^s\big), \tag{16}$$

where $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E_s)$ is considered as probability measure on the corresponding measurable space $(A, \mathcal{A}) \in \mathfrak{A}(E_s)$ as in (10). The mutual information $I\big(\xi_0^s; \eta_0^s\big)$ (see Definition B.1) is computed between the projections ξ_0^s and η_0^s from $A \times Y$ onto $A_0 \subset X_0^s$ and Y_0^s, regarded as random variables on the channel input-output probability space $(A \times Y, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{Y}, \mu\kappa)$.

(2.14) Remark. To define the information rate capacity of a channel with time structure the time index set T is at first partitioned into segments of size $s \in T_+$. The quantity C_s is the supremum of the mutual information between the channel input and output within the time period $(0, s]$, where the supremum is taken w. r. t. all $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E_s)$, i. e., w. r. t. all finite alphabet s-memoryless input sources satisfying the constraint E_s. Normalizing C_s by the time duration s and taking the limit superior w. r. t. s defines the information rate capacity C in [nat/channel use] if $T = \mathbb{Z}$ or in [nat/second] if $T = \mathbb{R}$. Note that optimizing w. r. t. discrete s-memoryless channel input sources is closely connected to the (potential) application as performance parameter for information transmission using block codes.

In the next lemma, different representations of the information rate capacity are given. The first is useful, e. g., to prove the coding theorem (converse) for stationary channels. The second relates Definition 2.13 to a mathematically useful process definition. For details please refer to the discussion in [3, Rmk. 5.4]. A proof of the lemma is given in Paragraph D.3 of Appendix D. It is mainly based on Lemma B.9 for which the proof given in Paragraph D.2 seems to be new and closes a gap in the proof in [2].

(2.15) Lemma (*Information rate capacity of stationary channels). Consider the information rate capacity $C = \limsup_{s\to\infty} C_s/s$ introduced in Definition 2.13 and additionally assume that the channel κ is stationary and the family $\mathcal{E}$ of input constraints satisfies the regularity condition (7). Then we have the identities*

$$C = \sup_{s\in T_+} \frac{1}{s} C_s, \tag{17}$$

$$C = \sup_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})} \bar{I}(\mu), \qquad \bar{I}(\mu) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{ns} I\big(\xi_0^{ns}; \eta_0^{ns}\big), \tag{18}$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ is defined in (11) and $s \in T_+$ in the definition of $\bar{I}(\mu)$ is the size of the segments of the time

axis T belonging to $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E_s)$. Further, $\xi_0^{ns} = \big(\xi_0^s, \xi_s^{2s}, \dots, \xi_{(n-1)s}^{ns}\big)$ and $\eta_0^{ns} = \big(\eta_0^s, \eta_s^{2s}, \dots, \eta_{(n-1)s}^{ns}\big)$, where $\xi_{ks}^{(k+1)s}$ and $\eta_{ks}^{(k+1)s}$ denote the projections from $A \times Y$ onto $A_k = \langle A_0 \rangle_{ks_0} \subset X_{ks}^{(k+1)s}$ and $Y_{ks}^{(k+1)s}$, respectively.

III. Coding Theorem and Weak Converse

For an abstract channel κ with time structure as introduced in Definition 2.4 with input product space X and output product measurable space $(Y, \mathcal{Y})$ we prove under quite general conditions a block coding theorem and a converse taking general input constraints into account, represented by the family $\mathcal{E} = \{E_s \subset X_0^s, s \in T_+\}$ of constraint sets.

III.A. Theorems and Proofs

(3.1) Theorem (*Coding theorem). Suppose the channel κ is stationary, causal, asymptotically input-memoryless for the signal set E', and totally ergodic w. r. t. $\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{E})$, with E' and $\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{E})$ as defined in (6) and (13). Further assume that the family $\mathcal{E}$ of input constraints satisfies the regularity condition (7).*

(i) If the information rate capacity C for the constraints $\mathcal{E}$ is finite, then for any $\rho \in (0, C)$, $\epsilon \in (0,1)$, and $b_0 \in T_+$ there exists a $(b, E_b, E', \mathrm{e}^{(C-\rho)b}, \epsilon)$-code for some block length $b \geq b_0$.

(ii) If C is infinite, then for any $R > 0$, $\epsilon \in (0,1)$, and $b_0 \in T_+$ there exists a $(b, E_b, E', \mathrm{e}^{Rb}, \epsilon)$-code for some block length $b \geq b_0$.

Proof: (i) *Setup.* Let us fix some $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. If $C < \infty$ we fix some $\rho \in (0, C)$ and put $R = C - \rho$. If $C = \infty$ then let $R > 0$ be arbitrary. Due to the definition of the information rate capacity given in Definition 2.13 there exists in both cases an $s_0 \in T_+$ and a channel input probability space $(A, \mathcal{A}, \mu) \in \mathfrak{P}(E_{s_0})$ such that

$$R < \frac{1}{s_0} I\big(\xi_0^{s_0}; \eta_0^{s_0}\big). \tag{19}$$

Let $\alpha = \{\alpha_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and $\beta = \{\beta_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ denote the sequences of projections on the channel input-output probability space $(A \times Y, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{Y}, \mu\kappa)$ as introduced in (64). Since the channel κ is assumed causal and asymptotically input-memoryless for the signal set E' it satisfies the measurability condition (M) due to Lemma 2.8. Therefore, the probability measure $\mu\kappa$ is well-defined. Further, let μ_0 denote the probability measure on $(A_0, \mathcal{A}_0) = \big(\{\mathtt{a}_{[1]}, \mathtt{a}_{[2]}, \dots, \mathtt{a}_{[\mathtt{M}]}\}, 2^{A_0}\big)$ as given in (66) from which the product measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E_{s_0})$ is built.

The channel κ is assumed to be asymptotically input-memoryless for the set E'. Due to (2.7.v) this implies there exists a minimal $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $B \in \mathcal{Y}_0^+$ and $x, \tilde{x} \in E'$ coinciding on $(-l_0 s_0, \infty)$

we have

$$\big|\kappa(x,[B]) - \kappa(\tilde{x},[B])\big| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \tag{20}$$

It follows together with the stationarity of κ, the equality $\mathcal{Y}^+_{l_0 s_0} = \langle \mathcal{Y}^+_0 \rangle_{l_0 s_0}$, and the shift-invariance of the set E' that (20) holds for any $B \in \mathcal{Y}^+_{l_0 s_0}$ and $x, \tilde{x} \in E'$ coinciding on $(0,\infty)$.

(ii) *Ergodic theorem.* The channel κ is assumed to be stationary so that it is in particular s_0-stationary according to (2.7.i). Together with the s_0-stationarity of μ we obtain from Lemma 2.9 the s_0-stationarity of the channel input-output probability measure $\mu\kappa$ (see Definition A.1). Further, the channel κ is assumed to be totally ergodic w. r. t. $\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{E})$, thus it is s_0-ergodic w. r. t. $\mathfrak{P}(E_{s_0})$. According to (2.7.ii) we obtain together with $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E_{s_0})$ that $\mu\kappa$ is s_0-ergodic (see Definition A.1). Therefore, the pair sequence $\{(\alpha_k, \beta_k), k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ of projections is stationary and ergodic. Furthermore, $\{\alpha_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a sequence of discrete random variables with finite alphabet of size M, since α_{k+1} has values in $A_k = \langle A_0 \rangle_{k s_0}$. Thus, the information rate $\bar{I}(\alpha;\beta)$ (see Definition B.8) exists and is finite due to Lemma B.11. Moreover, we can apply Theorem C.3 and obtain for any $\epsilon^* > 0$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mu\kappa\Big(f^{(n)}(\alpha_0^n, \beta_0^n) \le \mathrm{e}^{n(\bar{I}(\alpha;\beta) - \epsilon^*)} \Big) = 0, \tag{21}$$

where $f^{(n)}$ denotes the density of the distribution of (α_0^n, β_0^n) w. r. t. the product of the distributions of α_0^n and β_0^n. This density exists for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ since $\bar{I}(\alpha;\beta)$ is finite (see beginning of Remark C.4).

(iii) *Code size.* Let us fix

$$\epsilon^* = \frac{1}{3}\big(\bar{I}(\alpha;\beta) - R s_0\big). \tag{22}$$

As in Paragraph D.3 we obtain from $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E_{s_0})$ and κ being stationary that Lemma B.9 can be applied to the sequences α and β, which yields the inequalities

$$\frac{1}{s_0} I(\alpha_1;\beta_1) \le \frac{1}{n s_0} I(\alpha_0^n;\beta_0^n) \le \frac{1}{s_0} \bar{I}(\alpha;\beta) \tag{23}$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. From (19) and (23) we therefore obtain that ϵ^* is positive. Further, due to (21) we can choose a sufficiently large $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\mathrm{e}^{-n_0 \epsilon^*} < \frac{\epsilon}{4} \tag{24}$$

$$R l_0 s_0 + 1 < n_0 \epsilon^* \tag{25}$$

$$\mu\kappa\big((\alpha_0^{n_0}, \beta_0^{n_0}) \in G_\gamma^{\mathrm{c}}\big) < \frac{\epsilon}{4} \tag{26}$$

hold simultaneously, where

$$G_\gamma = \left\{ f^{(n_0)} > \mathrm{e}^\gamma \right\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \gamma = n_0(\bar{I}(\alpha;\beta) - \epsilon^*). \tag{27}$$

We continue by choosing an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ that satisfies

$$\mathrm{e}^{R(n_0+l_0)s_0} < m < \mathrm{e}^{Rn_0s_0+n_0\epsilon^*}, \tag{28}$$

which is possible due to (25). From (22), (24), and the right-hand side of (28) we obtain

$$m\mathrm{e}^{-\gamma} = \mathrm{e}^{-2n_0\epsilon^*+(\log m - Rn_0s_0)} < \mathrm{e}^{-n_0\epsilon^*} < \frac{\epsilon}{4}. \tag{29}$$

(iv) *Feinstein's lemma.* Let us put $t_0 = n_0s_0$. Based on the probability space $(A_0, \mathcal{A}_0, \mu_0)$ that generates the channel input probability space $(A, \mathcal{A}, \mu) \in \mathfrak{P}(E_{s_0})$ we define the (sub-) product measures

$$\mu_- = \bigotimes_{k=-1}^{-\infty} \mu_k \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mu_0' = \bigotimes_{k=0}^{n_0-1} \mu_k \tag{30}$$

on the (sub-) measurable spaces

$$(A_-, \mathcal{A}_-) = \left(\bigtimes_{k=-1}^{-\infty} A_k, \bigotimes_{k=-1}^{-\infty} \mathcal{A}_k \right), \qquad \text{and} \qquad (A_0', \mathcal{A}_0') = \left(\bigtimes_{k=0}^{n_0-1} A_k, \bigotimes_{k=0}^{n_0-1} \mathcal{A}_k \right), \tag{31}$$

respectively, where $(A_k, \mathcal{A}_k, \mu_k) = \big(\langle A_0 \rangle_{ks_0}, \langle \mathcal{A}_0 \rangle_{ks_0}, \langle \mu_0 \rangle_{ks_0} \big)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Since the channel κ is assumed causal we have for all $B \in \mathcal{Y}_0^{t_0}$ that $\kappa(a, [B])$ does only depend on coordinates of $a = \{a_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}\} \in A$ with index $k < n_0$, i. e., $\kappa(\cdot, [B])$ is in fact not a function on A but just on $A_- \times A_0'$. Therefore, we can write $\kappa\big((a_-, a_0'), [B]\big)$ with $(a_-, a_0') \in A_- \times A_0'$ instead of $\kappa(a, [B])$. Further, since κ is assumed causal and asymptotically input-memoryless for the signal set E' it satisfies the measurability condition (M) due to Lemma 2.8. Therefore, κ as function on $(A_- \times A_0') \times [\mathcal{Y}_0^{t_0}]$ is a Markov kernel from $(A_- \times A_0', \mathcal{A}_- \otimes \mathcal{A}_0')$ to $\big(Y, [\mathcal{Y}_0^{t_0}]\big)$ and we can define for any $a_0' \in A_0'$ and $B \in \mathcal{Y}_0^{t_0}$

$$\bar{\kappa}(a_0', B) = \int_{A_-} \kappa\big((a_-, a_0'), [B]\big) \, \mathrm{d}\mu_-(a_-). \tag{32}$$

From basic measure-theoretic results it follows that $\bar{\kappa}$ is a Markov kernel from $(A_0', \mathcal{A}_0')$ to $(Y_0^{t_0}, \mathcal{Y}_0^{t_0})$. Together with μ_0' it induces a probability measure on $(A_0' \times Y_0^{t_0}, \mathcal{A}_0' \otimes \mathcal{Y}_0^{t_0})$, say $\mu\kappa_0'$, given for any $F \in \mathcal{A}_0'$ and $G \in \mathcal{Y}_0^{t_0}$ by

$$\mu\kappa_0'(F \times G) = \int_F \bar{\kappa}(a_0', G) \, \mathrm{d}\mu_0'(a_0').$$

From the definition of $\mu\kappa$, the product structure of $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E_{s_0})$, the causality of κ, the definition of $\bar{\kappa}$, and basic measure-theoretic results (Fubini's theorem) we obtain that $\mu\kappa'_0$ is the distribution of $(\alpha_0^{n_0}, \beta_0^{n_0})$, since it is equal to the marginal measure of $\mu\kappa$ on $(A'_0 \times Y_0^{t_0}, \mathcal{A}'_0 \otimes \mathcal{Y}_0^{t_0})$. Furthermore, μ'_0 is the distribution of $\alpha_0^{n_0}$ and ν'_0 is the distribution of $\beta_0^{n_0}$, where ν'_0 denotes the marginal measure of $\mu\kappa'_0$ on $(Y_0^{t_0}, \mathcal{Y}_0^{t_0})$. It follows that the function $f^{(n_0)}$ used to define the set G_γ in (27) is the $\mu'_0 \otimes \nu'_0$-density of $\mu\kappa'_0$ and

$$\mu\kappa'_0\big(G_\gamma^{\mathrm{c}}\big) = \mu\kappa\big((\alpha_0^{n_0}, \beta_0^{n_0}) \in G_\gamma^{\mathrm{c}}\big). \tag{33}$$

Applying Feinstein's lemma given in Lemma C.1 we obtain that there exist

$$u'_1, u'_2, \ldots, u'_m \in A'_0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \hat{B}_1, \hat{B}_2, \ldots, \hat{B}_m \in \mathcal{Y}_0^{t_0}$$

such that

$$\bar{\kappa}(u'_i, \hat{B}_i^{\mathrm{c}}) < m\mathrm{e}^{-\gamma} + \mu\kappa'_0\big(G_\gamma^{\mathrm{c}}\big) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \tag{34}$$

hold for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$, where γ and m are chosen as in (27) and (28). The upper bound of $\epsilon/2$ is obtained from (26), (29), and (33).

(v) *Code construction.* The channel κ satisfies the measurability condition (M) w. r. t. $\mathcal{E}$ so that $\kappa\big((\cdot, u'_i), [\hat{B}_i^{\mathrm{c}}]\big)$ is a random variable on the probability space $(A_- \mathcal{A}_-, \mu_-)$ with expectation $\bar{\kappa}(u'_i, \hat{B}_i^{\mathrm{c}})$. Due to the causality $\kappa\big(\cdot, [\hat{B}_i^{\mathrm{c}}]\big)$ is considered here again as function on $A_- \times A'_0$. If the expectation of a random variable is less than some constant, then the probability that the random variable has values less than this constant is positive. Therefore, we obtain from (34)

$$\mu_-\Big(\kappa\big((\cdot, u'_i), [\hat{B}_i^{\mathrm{c}}]\big) < \epsilon/2\Big) > 0.$$

This implies that for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ there exists a $\hat{u}_i \in A_- \times A'_0$ coinciding on $(0, n_0 s_0]$ with u'_i such that

$$\kappa(\hat{u}_i, [\hat{B}_i^{\mathrm{c}}]) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

All $\hat{u}_i$ can be chosen $\hat{u}_i \in A$ as well due to the causality of the channel κ. The stationarity of κ then implies

$$\kappa\big(\hat{u}_i, [\hat{B}_i^{\mathrm{c}}]\big) = \kappa\big(\langle \hat{u}_i \rangle_{l_0 s_0}, \langle [\hat{B}_i] \rangle_{l_0 s_0}\big) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \tag{35}$$

Let u_i denote the projection of $\langle \hat{u}_i \rangle_{l_0 s_0}$ onto X_0^b and B_i the projection of $\langle [\hat{B}_i] \rangle_{l_0 s_0}$ onto Y_0^b, where b is given by

$$b = (n_0 + l_0) s_0.$$

The code

$$\mathcal{C} = \big\{ (u_i, B_i), i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\} \big\}$$

has a block length b and a code size $m > \mathrm{e}^{Rb}$ due to (28). Each decoding set satisfies $B_i \in \mathcal{Y}_0^b$ and $[B_i] = \langle [\hat{B}_i] \rangle_{l_0 s_0} \in [\mathcal{Y}_{l_0 s_0}^b]$. Because $u_i \in \times_{k=0}^{n_0+l_0-1} \langle A_0 \rangle_{k s_0}$ and $A_0 \subset E_{s_0}$ we have for each codeword $u_i \in E_b$, since we assume that the family $\mathcal{E}$ of input constraints satisfies the regularity condition (7). Furthermore, we assume that the channel κ is causal and asymptotically input-memoryless for the set E' so that (35) and the comment below (20) imply for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$

$$\kappa\big(x_i, [B_i^{\mathrm{c}}]\big) < \epsilon,$$

for all $x_i \in E'$ coinciding on $(0, b]$ with u_i. The maximal decoding error $\varrho_{\max}(E')$ is therefore bounded by ϵ. Thus, $\mathcal{C}$ is a $(b, E_b, E', \mathrm{e}^{Rb}, \epsilon)$-code, which completes the proof. ■

(3.2) Theorem (*Weak converse). Assume that the channel κ is stationary, satisfies the measurability condition (M) w. r. t. the family $\mathcal{E}$ of input constraints, and $\mathcal{E}$ satisfies the regularity condition (7).*

If the information rate capacity C of κ for the constraints $\mathcal{E}$ is finite, then for any $\rho > 0$ there exists a constant $\epsilon^* = \epsilon^*(\rho, C) \in (0, 1)$, such that for any $\epsilon < \epsilon^*$ and block length $b \in T_+$ there does not exist a $(b, E_b, U_b^*, \mathrm{e}^{(C+\rho)b}, \epsilon)$-code, where U_b^* is defined in (14).

(3.3) Remark (Discussion, optimistic vs. pessimistic coding capacity). Since we have $U_b^* \subset E_b^* \subset E'$ for the sets specified in (4) and (6) the weak converse holds if U_b^* is replaced by E_b^* or E'.

Clearly, the weak converse does only make sense for finite information rate capacity. It holds in particular under the conditions of Theorem 3.1, which also imply due to Lemma 2.8 that the channel κ satisfies the measurability condition (M) w. r. t. $\mathcal{E}$. The combination of the coding theorem and converse establishes the operational significance of the information rate capacity as introduced in Definition 2.13. Various important examples of channel models satisfying all the required properties are discussed in [3, Chs. IV and V] together with tools useful to study these properties.

Note that the coding theorem is a statement in the sense of an optimistic coding capacity [54, p. 176],

which means for code rates below C the existence of "good" codes is guaranteed for infinitely many block lengths, however, not necessarily for all block lengths above a certain minimum value. In contrast, the more commonly considered pessimistic capacity concept means that once we have found a good code, then it is guaranteed that for all larger block lengths good codes exist [54, p. 176]. For a corresponding version of Theorem 3.1 the second part of (3.1.i) would read as follows: *" ... , then for any* $\rho \in (0, C)$ *and* $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ *there exists a* $b_0 \in T_+$ *such that for all block lengths* $b \geq b_0$ *there exists a* $(b, E_b, E', \mathrm{e}^{(C-\rho)b}, \epsilon)$*-code."* The reformulation of (3.1.ii) would be similar. Now, if the limit superior in the definition of C in (16) is replaced by the limit inferior, then the preceding statement would be the result of the proof of the coding theorem. This follows from the fact that the quantity s_0 chosen in the beginning of the proof of Theorem 3.1 can then be replaced by any $\tilde{s}_0 \geq s_0$. Therefore, if the limit in (16) exists, i. e., if the limit superior and inferior are equal, then C is also equal to the pessimistic coding capacity. Consequently, it is worth to investigate general conditions under which the limit exists.

Proof: (i) *Setup.* Let us fix some $\rho > 0$, a block length $b \in T_+$, and an integer $m \geq \mathrm{e}^{(C+\rho)b}$. Further, let

$$\mathcal{C}(b, E_b) = \big\{(u_i, B_i), i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}\big\}$$

be some block code satisfying the input constraint E_b. We define the probability space $(A_0, \mathcal{A}_0, \mu_0)$ with

$$A_0 = \big\{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_m\big\} \subset E_b \subset X_0^b, \qquad \mathcal{A}_0 = 2^{A_0}, \qquad \mu_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i \delta_{u_i}, \tag{36}$$

where we choose without loss of generality $p_i = 1/m$. Further, we define the product measures

$$\mu_- = \bigotimes_{k=-1}^{-\infty} \mu_k \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mu_+ = \bigotimes_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_k \tag{37}$$

on the measurable spaces

$$(A_-, \mathcal{A}_-) = \left(\bigtimes_{k=-1}^{-\infty} A_k, \bigotimes_{k=-1}^{-\infty} \mathcal{A}_k\right) \qquad \text{and} \qquad (A_+, \mathcal{A}_+) = \left(\bigtimes_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k, \bigotimes_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_k\right),$$

respectively, where $(A_k, \mathcal{A}_k, \mu_k) = \big(\langle A_0\rangle_{kb}, \langle \mathcal{A}_0\rangle_{kb}, \langle \mu_0\rangle_{kb}\big)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Subsequently, we consider

$$(A, \mathcal{A}, \mu) = \big(A_- \times A_0 \times A_+,\, \mathcal{A}_- \otimes \mathcal{A}_0 \otimes \mathcal{A}_+,\, \mu_- \otimes \mu_0 \otimes \mu_+\big) \tag{38}$$

as input probability space of the channel κ, which satisfies $(A, \mathcal{A}, \mu) \in \mathfrak{P}(E_b)$. The resulting input-output probability space $(A \times Y, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{Y}, \mu\kappa)$ is well-defined since κ is assumed to satisfy the measurability

condition (M) w. r. t. $\mathcal{E}$. Let ξ_0^b and η_0^b denote the projections from $A \times Y$ onto $A_0 \subset X_0^b$ and Y_0^b, respectively, regarded as random variables on $(A \times Y, \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{Y}, \mu\kappa)$. Further, let α und β denote the functions defined on A_0 and Y_0^b, respectively, given by

$$\alpha(a_0) = i \quad \text{if} \quad a_0 = u_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad \beta(y_0^b) = j \quad \text{if} \quad y_0^b \in B_j.$$

(ii) *Applying Fano's inequality.* At first, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I\big(\alpha(\xi_0^b); \beta(\eta_0^b)\big) &\le I\big(\xi_0^b; \eta_0^b\big) \\ &\le C_b \\ &\le bC, \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where the first inequality follows from (B.7.iv). Since $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E_b)$ belongs to the class of probability measures w. r. t. which C_b is defined in Definition 2.13, we obtain the second inequality. We assume a stationary channel κ and a family of input constraints $\mathcal{E}$ satisfying the regularity condition (7). Therefore, we can apply Lemma 2.15 and obtain the last inequality from (17).

If p_e is given by

$$\begin{aligned} p_e &= \mu\kappa\big(\alpha(\xi_0^b) \neq \beta(\eta_0^b)\big) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mu\kappa\big(\alpha(\xi_0^b) = i,\, \beta(\eta_0^b) \neq i\big) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mu\kappa\big([\{u_i\}] \times [B_i^c]\big), \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h_m(p_e) &\ge H\big(\alpha(\xi_0^b) \,|\, \beta(\eta_0^b)\big) \\ &= \log m - I\big(\alpha(\xi_0^b); \beta(\eta_0^b)\big) \\ &\ge \log m - bC \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{C}{\log(m)/b}\right) \log m \\ &\ge \left(1 - \frac{C}{C+\rho}\right) \log m. \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Fano's inequality given in Lemma C.5 yields the first inequality, where h_m is defined in (54). The subsequent equality holds due to (B.7.vii) and the first equality in (B.7.v), because $\mu\kappa\big(\alpha(\xi_0^b) = i\big) =$

$\mu\kappa\big(\xi_0^b = u_i\big) = \mu_0\big(\{u_i\}\big) = 1/m$. The next inequality follows from (39) and the last from the assumption $m \geq \mathrm{e}^{(C+\rho)b}$.

Assume that we restrict the function h_m to the interval $[0, (m-1)/m]$ and denote the corresponding inverse by h_m^{-1}. Then h_m^{-1} is a well-defined, monotonically increasing function on $[0, \log m]$ with values in $[0, (m-1)/m]$. The following chain of inequalities holds

$$0 < h_{m-1}^{-1}\big(b\log(m-2)\big) < h_m^{-1}\big(b\log(m-1)\big) < h_m^{-1}\big(b\log m\big) \tag{42}$$

for all $0 < b \leq 1$ and $m \geq 4$. If $m = 2$, then the two terms in the middle have to be omitted and if $m = 3$, then only the left of these terms has to be omitted. Applying h_m^{-1} to (41) and using (42) yields

$$p_e \geq h_{m_0}^{-1}\left(\left[1 - \frac{C}{C+\rho}\right]\log 2\right) > 0, \tag{43}$$

where $m_0 = 2$ if $m = 2$ and $m_0 = 3$ if $m > 2$. We have also used $(1 - C/(C+\rho)) \in (0,1)$.

(iii) *Evaluation of error probabilities.* We define for any $a_0 \in A_0$ and $B \in \mathcal{Y}_0^b$

$$\bar{\kappa}(a_0, B) = \int_{A_-\times A_+} \kappa\big((a_-, a_0, a_+), [B]\big)\,\mathrm{d}\mu_-\otimes\mu_+(a_-, a_+) \tag{44}$$

using the measures defined in (37) and the representation of an element $a \in A$ as 3-tupel $a = (a_-, a_0, a_+) \in A_-\times A_0\times A_+$. The integral is well-defined since κ is assumed to satisfy the measurability condition (M). Basic measure-theoretic considerations yield $\bar{\kappa}$ is a Markov kernel from $(A_0, \mathcal{A}_0)$ to $(Y_0^b, \mathcal{Y}_0^b)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu\kappa\big([\{u_i\}]\times[B_i^{\mathrm{c}}]\big) &= \int_{[\{u_i\}]}\kappa(a, [B_i^{\mathrm{c}}])\,\mathrm{d}\mu(a)\\ &= \int_{\{u_i\}}\bar{\kappa}(a_0, B_i^{\mathrm{c}})\,\mathrm{d}\mu_0(a_0)\\ &= \frac{1}{m}\bar{\kappa}(u_i, B_i^{\mathrm{c}}),\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

where the first equality is simply the definition of the channel input-output probability measure. From the specific product structure of μ defined in (38) we obtain the second equality using Fubini's theorem. The last equality is due to the definition of the measure μ_0 in (36).

Inserting (45) into (40) and using (43) yields, that at least for one $i_0 \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ we have

$$\bar{\kappa}(u_{i_0}, B_{i_0}^{\mathrm{c}}) \geq \epsilon^* > 0, \tag{46}$$

where ϵ^* is defined as the middle expression of (43). Using the product structure of $(A, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ given in (38) and because $\kappa(\cdot, [B_{i_0}^{\mathrm{c}}])$ is an $\mathcal{A}$-measurable function on A due to condition (M) we can consider

$\kappa\big((\cdot, u_{i_0}\cdot), [B_{i_0}^{\mathrm{c}}]\big)$ as random variable on the probability space $(A_- \times A_+, \mathcal{A}_- \otimes \mathcal{A}_+, \mu_- \otimes \mu_+)$. If the expectation of a nonnegative random variable is greater or equal to some constant, then the probability that the random variable has values greater or equal to this constant is positive. Since $\bar{\kappa}(u_{i_0}, B_{i_0}^{\mathrm{c}})$ is the expectation of $\kappa\big((\cdot, u_{i_0}, \cdot), [B_{i_0}^{\mathrm{c}}]\big)$ we obtain from (46)

$$\mu_- \otimes \mu_+ \Big(\kappa\big((\cdot, u_{i_0}, \cdot), [B_{i_0}^{\mathrm{c}}]\big) \geq \epsilon^*\Big) > 0.$$

This implies, that at least for one $x \in U_b^* \cap [\{u_{i_0}\}]$ we have

$$\kappa(x, [B_{i_0}^{\mathrm{c}}]) \geq \epsilon^* > 0,$$

where $U_b^* = A$ holds with U_b^* as defined in (14). Thus we have $\varrho_{\max}(U_b^*) \geq \epsilon^*$ for the maximal decoding error, which completes the proof. ■

(3.4) Remark (Average decoding error probability). The coding theorem and converse are stated for the maximal decoding error probability $\varrho_{\max}(\cdot)$ as defined in (15). Alternatively, we can consider the average decoding error probability. Based on the notation of Definition 2.11 it is given by

$$\bar{\varrho}(\cdot) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{C}|} \varrho(u_i, \cdot).$$

It follows immediately that Theorem 3.1 also holds for the average decoding error probability. To verify Theorem 3.2 for $\bar{\varrho}(U_b^*)$ we have to have a closer look. Let us follow the proof of the weak converse up to inequality (46). Then we observe that even

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \bar{\kappa}(u_i, B_i^{\mathrm{c}}) \geq \epsilon^* > 0$$

holds. Similar to the last part of the preceding proof we can therefore conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\varrho}(U_b^*) &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sup_{(a_-, a_+) \in A_- \times A_+} \kappa\big((a_-, u_i, a_+), [B_i^{\mathrm{c}}]\big) \\
&\geq \sup_{(a_-, a_+) \in A_- \times A_+} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \kappa\big((a_-, u_i, a_+), [B_i^{\mathrm{c}}]\big) \\
&\geq \epsilon^* > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that Theorem 3.2 also holds for the average decoding error.

III.B. On Measurability Requirements

As already addressed in Remark 2.2 Ahlswede pointed out in [1, Sec. 6.1], where discrete-time memoryless channels (see Remark 4.7) with abstract alphabet are considered, that requiring the measurability of the channel w. r. t. the input signals is not necessary when studying coding problems. Let us explain this aspect and the difference to the situation in this paper, where a coding theorem and a converse are derived for channels, that are allowed to have also infinite input memory.

Generally speaking, if the channel κ is memoryless, then we have to deal in all steps of the derivations only with input signals of finite duration and therefore only with a finite set $\{\kappa(a,\cdot)\}$ of probability measures defined by the channel. This set can always be considered as Markov kernel by using the power set of the relevant finite input signal set as σ-algebra. This way measurability issues do not arise. However, if the input memory is allowed to be infinite, then we have to deal with input signals of infinite duration so that an uncountable set $\{\kappa(a,\cdot)\}$ of probability measures have to be taken into account. Then measurability aspects come necessarily into play because working with the power set of an uncountable set of input signals as σ-algebra (w. r. t. which all functions would be measurable because it is the largest possible σ-algebra) does not work in this context.

Let us investigate one representative part of the proof of the coding theorem given in Theorem 3.1 to gain more inside into the preceding argumentation. In the proof we consider a probability measure μ_0, that is concentrated on finitely many input signals in a certain time interval, i. e., μ_0 has finite support. Looking into part (iv) of the proof we see that the probability measure μ_0' given in (30) has finite support as well, since it is defined on the finite space $(A_0', \mathcal{A}_0')$ as a product of shifted copies of μ_0. If the channel κ is memoryless, then $\kappa(\cdot,[B])$ is a function just on $(A_0', \mathcal{A}_0')$ for all $B \in \mathcal{Y}_0^{t_0}$, because for a memoryless channel the probability of events at the channel output in a certain time interval only depend on the channel input in the same time interval. In the remainder of the proof the relevant channel is therefore given by the finite set $\{\kappa(a_0',\cdot), a_0' \in A_0'\}$ of probability measures. In contrast, if the input memory is infinite, then in part (iv) of the proof the set $\{\kappa((a_-,a_0'),\cdot), a_- \in A_-, a_0' \in A_0'\}$ of probability measures has to be taken into account, e. g., to define the induced channel $\bar{\kappa}$ in (32). The set of measures is uncountable because the set A_- is uncountable (which might be surprising but indeed, the countable infinite product of finite sets is uncountable). Thus, for (32) to be well-defined we have to consider a measurability condition such as (M). Under the requirements of the coding theorem regarding causality and type of input memory, however, the condition (M) is automatically satisfied so that it does not pose additional restrictions. The previously described situation is similar when we look into part (iii) of the

proof of the converse given in Theorem 3.2. Note that a causal channel with finite input memory behaves analog to a memoryless channel regarding the (non)requirement of a measurability condition.

In many situations of the paper it is sufficient that the channel input-output probability measure $\mu\kappa$ is well-defined. This applies to the definition of ergodicity in (2.7.ii) and information rate capacity in Definition 2.13, to Lemma 2.9 and Lemma 2.15 as well as to parts (i)–(iii) in the proof of the coding theorem and parts (i)–(ii) in the proof of the converse. A well-defined measure $\mu\kappa$ is already guaranteed for the following weaker measurability condition. We say the channel κ satisfies the measurability condition

(M′) w. r. t. $\mathcal{E}$, if for all $(A,\mathcal{A}) \in \mathfrak{A}(\mathcal{E})$ and $G \in \mathfrak{C}'_{_Y}$ it holds that $\kappa(\cdot, G)$ as function on A is $\mathcal{A}$-measurable, where $\mathfrak{C}'_{_Y}$ is the set of cylinder sets on Y defined by

$$\mathfrak{C}'_{_Y} = \left\{ \underset{t\in T}{\times} G_t \subset Y : G_t \in \mathcal{Y}_t, \text{ where only finitely many } G_t \neq Y_t \right\}.$$

The set $\mathfrak{C}'_{_Y}$ is a semiring generating the product σ-algebra $\mathcal{Y}$, i. e., $\mathcal{Y} = \sigma(\mathfrak{C}'_{_Y})$. Thus, (1) is well-defined for a probability measure μ on $(A,\mathcal{A}) \in \mathfrak{A}(\mathcal{E})$. Obviously, if (M) is satisfied then (M′) is satisfied as well since $\mathfrak{C}'_{_Y} \subset \mathfrak{C}_{_Y}$, with $\mathfrak{C}_{_Y}$ as given in (3). The more restrictive condition (M) is only required in part (iv) and (v) in the proof of the coding theorem and part (iii) in the proof of the converse, where $\kappa(\cdot, B)$ has to be considered as random variable for certain $B \in \mathfrak{C}_{_Y}$.

We continue with a discussion on an alternative measurability condition. Recall that we consider a channel κ with time structure as introduced in Definition 2.4 with input product space X defined in (2) by the family $\{X_t, t \in T\}$ of sets with $X_t = X_0$ for all $t \in T$. Assume that we have given the family $\{\mathcal{X}_t, t \in T\}$ of σ-algebras, where $\mathcal{X}_t$ is a σ-algebra on X_t. We define the product σ-algebra

$$\mathcal{X} = \bigotimes_{t\in T} \mathcal{X}_t,$$

and say the channel κ satisfies the measurability condition

(M″) if for all $B \in \mathcal{Y}$ it holds that $\kappa(\cdot, B)$ as function on X is $\mathcal{X}$-measurable.

As shown in [3] the derivations of the coding theorem and converse also work if the channel κ satisfies the condition (M″). Following the derivations in [3], one observes that the σ-algebra $\mathcal{X}_t$ can be chosen largest possible, i. e., $\mathcal{X}_t = 2^{X_t}$ and the measurability of $\kappa(\cdot, B)$ w. r. t. all $B \in \mathfrak{C}_{_Y}$ is already sufficient, where $\mathfrak{C}_{_Y}$ is defined in (3). To work with condition (M″) we have to regard μ_0 in (10) as probability measure on the space $(X_0^s, \mathcal{X}_0^s)$, i. e., the Dirac measures are defined on $(X_0^s, \mathcal{X}_0^s)$. Then $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E_s)$ as

defined in (10) is a probability measure on $(X, \mathcal{X})$ since we have the identities

$$X = \underset{t\in T}{\times} X_t = \underset{k\in\mathbb{Z}}{\times} X_{ks}^{(k+1)s} = \underset{k\in\mathbb{Z}}{\times} \langle X_0^s \rangle_{ks} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{X} = \bigotimes_{t\in T} \mathcal{X}_t = \bigotimes_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{X}_{ks}^{(k+1)s} = \bigotimes_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \langle \mathcal{X}_0^s \rangle_{ks}.$$

In (12) the space $(A, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ is then replaced by the space $(X, \mathcal{X}, \mu)$. Further, the channel input-output probability measure $\mu\kappa$ generated by μ and the channel κ based on (1) is regarded as measure on the space $(X \times Y, \mathcal{X} \otimes \mathcal{Y})$. If $(X \times Y, \mathcal{X} \otimes \mathcal{Y}, \mu\kappa)$ is considered as underlying probability space all definitions, e. g., of ergodicity in (2.7.ii) or of information rate capacity in Definition 2.13 are well-defined under condition (M′′). The proofs of Lemma 2.15, Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 work analog to that given in this paper as demonstrated in [3]. However, outer measures and a special form of Feinstein's lemma have to be used in [3], which is not required in this paper, leading to simplified derivations.

Condition (M′′) is in some sense natural because the product σ-algebra $\mathcal{X}$ is the typical σ-algebra for which the distribution of a random process with time index set T is defined. For example, if the result in [3, Thm. 13.11] is used to study the memory properties of the pair random process at the channel input and output, then (M′′) is the adequate condition. However, the validity of (M′′) has to be verified separately for each concrete channel, which can be difficult if not impossible, in particular for continuous-time channels with memory. In contrast, due to Lemma 2.8 condition (M) is automatically satisfied for the channel properties needed anyway to prove the coding theorem. Therefore, in the context of coding problems it is clearly the better choice to work with (M) instead of (M′′). Note that in general (M′′) does not imply (M) and (M) does not imply (M′′).

The coding results in [2] for continuous-time channels with real-valued input and output signals are derived as well under the assumption of (M′′), where $\mathcal{X}_t$ is taken as the usual Borel σ-algebra on $X_t = \mathbb{R}$. Being able to use condition (M) in the present paper is closely related to the way we introduce the information rate capacity. Based on the definition of information rate capacity in [2] the use of (M) is not possible.

IV. Output Memory Conditions

Output memory conditions characterize – for given channel input – the (asymptotic) independence of sufficiently time-separated channel output events. There is a great variety of such conditions that are either based on ergodic-theoretic mixing properties or on so-called strong mixing properties specified by stochastic dependence coefficients. In [3, § 13] such conditions are analyzed and reviewed in detail. By the hierarchy derived in [3, Thm. 13.10] it is shown how these conditions are related and that they all imply the ergodicity of a channel with time structure as required in Theorem 3.1. In particular, it is

shown how much weaker the ergodicity condition (2.7.ii) is, compared to the output memory condition considered in the coding theorem in [2], called ψ-mixing condition. The ergodicity condition (2.7.ii) is the least restrictive condition possible to apply the ergodic theorem of information theory in the present context. In contrast, the ψ-mixing condition, which is defined using the ψ-dependence coefficient, is significantly more restrictive as will be demonstrated below by showing that for the important class of Gaussian channels it is in fact equivalent to finite output memory. Based on the example of a simple, practically relevant additive Gaussian noise channel with rational spectral density we show that the coding theorem in [2] does not apply to important channel models, for which Theorem 3.1 still holds.

As before κ is a channel with time structure as introduced in Definition 2.4 with input product space X and output product measurable space $(Y, \mathcal{Y})$. Further, $\eta = \{\eta_t, t \in T\}$ denotes the family of coordinate projections on the channel output space, where η_t denotes the projection from Y onto Y_t, and η_u^v denotes the projection from Y onto Y_u^v for all $u < v \in \overline{T}$. Whenever Y_t is equal to the set of real numbers or vectors, then we associate with it the corresponding Borel-σ-algebra.

(4.1) Definition (ψ-dependence coefficient). Let α and β be random variables on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathrm{P})$ with values in the measurable spaces $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}')$ and $(\Omega'', \mathcal{F}'')$, respectively. Then the ψ-dependence coefficient of α and β is defined by

$$\psi(\alpha;\beta) = \sup \left| \frac{\mathrm{P}_{\alpha,\beta}(F \times G)}{\mathrm{P}_\alpha(F)\mathrm{P}_\beta(G)} - 1 \right|,$$

where the supremum is taken w. r. t. all $F \in \mathcal{F}'$ and $G \in \mathcal{F}''$ satisfying the condition $\mathrm{P}_\alpha(F)\mathrm{P}_\beta(G) > 0$. By $\mathrm{P}_{\alpha,\beta}$, P_α, and P_β we denote the distribution of (α, β), α, and β, respectively.

(4.2) Remark. Recall that the mutual information measures the dependence between two random variables since it measures the difference between the joint distribution and the product of the marginal distributions in terms of relative entropy. The ψ-dependence coefficient quantifies this difference in another way. It represents therefore an alternative measure of stochastic (in)dependence. It is used below to define the channel output memory condition considered in [2].

The given definition is based on the space of values. From the discussion in [3, Rmk. 7.6], however, we obtain that it is equivalent to the definition based on the underlying probability space as given in [55, Def. 3.3] and [3, Def. 7.5].

(4.3) Properties of ψ-dependence coefficient. Let α and β be random variables on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathrm{P})$.

(i) *Nonnegativity:* We have

$$0 \le \psi(\alpha;\beta),$$

where equality holds if and only if α and β are independent.

(ii) *Monotonicity:* If $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ is a random vector, then we have

$$\psi(\alpha_1;\beta) \le \psi(\alpha;\beta).$$

(iii) *ψ-dependence coefficient and Gaussian distribution:* If (α, β) is a 2-dimensional Gaussian random vector, then we have

$$\psi(\alpha;\beta) < 2 \implies \mathrm{cor}(\alpha,\beta) = 0,$$

where $\mathrm{cor}(\alpha,\beta)$ denotes the correlation coefficient of α and β.

(4.4) Remark. Below we only require the three listed properties of the ψ-dependence coefficient. Part (i) and (ii) follow directly from the definition of the ψ-dependence coefficient. The implication in part (iii) is obtained by combining Prop. 3.4 (d), Prop. 3.11 (a), and Th. 9.7 (I) of [55]. The underlying result for the proof is given in [56, Th. 17.3.2].

(4.5) Definition (Finite output memory). The channel κ has finite output memory if for all $s \in T$ there exists a $t_o(s) \in T_0$ such that for any $B \in \mathcal{Y}_-^s$, $\hat{B} \in \mathcal{Y}_{s+t_o(s)}^+$, and $x \in X$ we have

$$\kappa(x, [B] \cap [\hat{B}]) = \kappa(x, [B])\kappa(x, [\hat{B}]).$$

For given $s \in T$ we call the smallest possible $t_o(s)$ the output memory length at time s. If $t_o(s) = 0$ for all $s \in T$, then we say the channel is output-memoryless.

(4.6) Definition (ψ-mixing channel). The channel κ is called ψ-mixing if for all $s \in T$

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \sup_{x\in X} \psi\big(\eta_-^s; \eta_{s+t}^+ \,\big|\, x\big) = 0,$$

where $\psi\big(\eta_-^s; \eta_{s+t}^+ \,\big|\, x\big)$ denotes the ψ-dependence coefficient of η_-^s and η_{s+t}^+, considered as random variables on the channel output probability space $(Y, \mathcal{Y}, \kappa(x,\cdot))$.

(4.7) Remark (Alternative definitions and terms, interpretation, memoryless channels). Note that we have the following equivalent definition of finite output memory: The channel κ has finite output memory if for all $s \in T$ there exists a $t_o(s) \in T_0$ such that for all $x \in X$ the random variables η_-^s and $\eta_{s+t_o(s)}^+$ are independent. Using (4.3.i) and (4.3.ii) we obtain still another equivalent definition: The channel κ has finite output memory if for all $s \in T$ there exists a $t_o(s) \in T_0$ such that for all $t \geq t_o(s)$ we have

$$\sup_{x \in X} \psi\big(\eta_-^s; \eta_{s+t}^+ \,\big|\, x\big) = 0.$$

Finite channel output memory means, sufficiently time-separated output events are independent given a fixed input. The ψ-mixing condition, in turn, means that for given input, future and present outputs are asymptotically independent from outputs remote in the past, where the (in)dependence is measured in terms of the ψ-dependence coefficient. In [2] the ψ-mixing channels are introduced under the name asymptotically output-memoryless channels. We reformulated this property using the ψ-dependence coefficient. An essential advantage of using this representation is that one can exploit more easily the connections to the rich field of strong mixing conditions.

In the discrete-time case, i. e., when $T = \mathbb{Z}$, the channel κ is called memoryless if it is causal, input-memoryless (see (2.7.iii) and (2.7.iv)), and output-memoryless. Often it is meant that the assumption of stationarity is included as well. Due to its simplicity, this special case, often with finite alphabets, is the most widely used model in the information-theoretic literature.

(4.8) Definition (Gaussian channel). Suppose we have real (vector-) valued output signals, i. e., $Y_0 = \mathbb{R}^n$ for some positive integer n. If for all input signals $x \in X$ the family $\eta = \{\eta_t, t \in T\}$ of coordinate projections defined on the channel output probability space $(Y, \mathcal{Y}, \kappa(x, \cdot))$ is a Gaussian (vector) process, then κ is called Gaussian channel.

(4.9) Remark. For the definition of a Gaussian random process see [3, Appendix A.6] and the references given there. We assume that all second moments of the involved random processes are finite, which is convenient for analysis and does not pose restrictions to models of practical situations. We restrict ourselves to the real case, however, the extension to the complex case is canonical. Note that we have not specified the input alphabet in the definition. The additive Gaussian noise channel considered in Example 4.11 below with $X_0 = Y_0 = \mathbb{R}$ is the most prominent example of a Gaussian channel. However, the class of Gaussian channels is much larger, including for example Gaussian (Rayleigh) fading channels.

The next theorem demonstrates how restrictive the output memory condition considered in [2] is. We

show that for the important class of Gaussian channels the condition is indeed equivalent to finite output memory. The result was given by the authors in [57]. The subsequent example then provides a simple, practically relevant channel with infinite output memory, which is excluded by the coding theorem in [2], however, for which Theorem 3.1 holds.

(4.10) Theorem (*ψ-mixing Gaussian channels have finite output memory). Let κ be a Gaussian channel. Then κ is ψ-mixing if and only if κ has finite output memory.*

Proof: If κ has finite output memory, then it follows from the second of the equivalent definitions in Remark 4.7 and from Definition 4.6 that κ is ψ-mixing.

Conversely, if κ is ψ-mixing, then according to Definition 4.6 there exists for any $s \in T$ a $t_o(s) \in T_0$, such that for all $\tilde{t} \geq t_o(s)$ we have

$$\sup_{x \in X} \psi\big(\eta_-^s; \eta_{s+\tilde{t}}^+ \,\big|\, x\big) < 2. \tag{47}$$

Since the family $\{\eta_t, t \in T\}$ of projections is a real n-dimensional Gaussian vector process we have $Y_t = Y_{t,1} \times \ldots \times Y_{t,n}$ with $Y_{t,i} = \mathbb{R}$. If $\eta_{t,i}$ denotes the projection from Y onto $Y_{t,i}$, then $\eta_{t,i}$ is a scalar Gaussian random variable and due to (47) and (4.3.ii) we have for all $x \in X$

$$\psi\big(\eta_{t_1,i}; \eta_{t_2,j} \,\big|\, x\big) < 2,$$

which implies together with (4.3.iii)

$$\operatorname{cor}\big(\eta_{t_1,i}, \eta_{t_2,j} \,\big|\, x\big) = 0$$

for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, $t_1 \leq s$, and $t_2 > s + t_o(s)$. From [55, A901], which is based on the finite-dimensional result in [58, Thm. 9.5.14], we obtain that η_-^s and $\eta_{s+t_o(s)}^+$ are independent as random variables on the probability space $(Y, \mathcal{Y}, \kappa(x, \cdot))$ for all $x \in X$. The only-if-part then follows from the first of the equivalent representations of finite output memory given in Remark 4.7. ■

(4.11) Example (Additive Gaussian noise). Assume that the channel κ has real-valued input and output signals, i. e., $X_0 = Y_0 = \mathbb{R}$. Let $(Z, \mathcal{Z})$ denote the product measurable space generated by the family $\{(Z_t, \mathcal{Z}_t), t \in T\}$ of measurable spaces, for which $(Z_t, \mathcal{Z}_t) = (Z_0, \mathcal{Z}_0)$, where $Z_0 = \mathbb{R}$ with $\mathcal{Z}_0$ being the usual Borel-σ-algebra on $\mathbb{R}$. Further, let $\zeta = \{\zeta_t, t \in T\}$ denote the family of coordinate projections defined on Z, where ζ_t denotes the projection from Z onto Z_t. Assume that λ is a probability measure on $(Z, \mathcal{Z})$.

Suppose the family $\eta = \{\eta_t, t \in T\}$ of coordinate projections on the channel output space is given for any $x \in X$ by

$$\eta = x + \zeta,$$

where addition is defined pointwise, i. e., $\eta_t = x_t + \zeta_t$ for all $t \in T$. That means, $\kappa(x, \cdot) = \lambda_{x+\zeta}$, i. e., $\kappa(x, \cdot)$ is equal to the distribution of the random process $x + \zeta$ for all $x \in X$. This channel is called additive noise channel.

Assume that ζ is a stationary zero mean, second order Gaussian process. Then η is a Gaussian process with mean x and the same covariance function as ζ. If the support of the covariance function of the additive noise ζ is not a finite interval, then κ does not satisfy the finite output memory condition as can be seen from the first of the equivalent definitions given in Remark 4.7. Thus, κ is not ψ-mixing according to Theorem 4.10. As an example assume that ζ has a rational spectral density which is truly rational, i. e., which has an autoregressive part. The most simple process of this type is an autoregressive process of order one as given, e. g., in [3, Exm. 12.4.ii and Exm. C.4]. Then we have the previously described situation, which means for such channels the version of the coding theorem given in [2] is not applicable. However, Theorem 3.1 is applicable because the required ergodicity condition and also the remaining conditions on the channel are satisfied as shown in [3, Par. 16.3], where this example is studied in detail. Stationary Gaussian noise with a rational spectral density results from passing stationary white Gaussian noise through a (well-behaved) linear filter. It is therefore relevant to model various practical situations. This example demonstrates that the original formulation of the coding theorem in [2] for ψ-mixing channels does not apply to important channel models, which are covered by Theorem 3.1.

V. Discussion and Summary of Results

Essentially, the main contribution of this paper is a generalization of the work of Kadota and Wyner [2], formulated in rigorous mathematical terms. The theorems in Section III generalize the work in [2] in a number of respects, namely in terms of channel model, input constraints, definition of information rate capacity, and, most importantly, w. r. t. required channel properties. Let us summarize the relevant extensions and modifications in relation to this work. In [2] a continuous-time channel with real-valued input and output signals is considered and a coding theorem and converse for those channels is formulated. In contrast, the theorems in Section III apply to channels with time structure in general, i. e., to discrete- as well as continuous-time channels with completely arbitrary alphabets. A consequent measure-theoretic description, in particular the use of general product spaces allows this generalized and unified formulation.

For Theorem 3.1 as well as the coding theorem in [2] the considered channel is required to be stationary, causal, and asymptotically input-memoryless. Clearly, finite input memory is included as special case since it implies asymptotic input-memorylessness, which is in general a form of infinite input memory. In addition, both theorems include a condition concerning the channel output memory, however, of fairly different quality. A property called asymptotic output-memorylessness is used in [2], which is called ψ-mixing condition in Definition 4.6. This output memory condition is quite restrictive, in particular for the important class of Gaussian channels. In Theorem 4.10 we show that for Gaussian channels it is indeed equivalent to finite output memory. As a result, the version of the theorem in [2] is for example not applicable to the important stationary additive Gaussian noise channel with rational noise spectral density as discussed in Example 4.11.

The condition of total ergodicity w. r. t. $\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{E})$, i. e., w. r. t. all finite alphabet block-memoryless input sources satisfying the constraints $\mathcal{E}$, used in Theorem 3.1 is much weaker than the ψ-mixing condition as demonstrated by the hierarchy in [3, Thm. 13.9]. It is also weaker than the condition used in [3, Def. 2.7] since only finite alphabet sources are taken into account. As demonstrated in [3, Par. 16.4] it is also strictly weaker than the total ergodicity considered in [59, Def. 1] or [52, p. 360]. We are able to prove the coding theorem under the weaker condition by introducing a suitable definition of information rate capacity in Definition 2.13. Indeed, this allows us to apply a quite simple version of the ergodic theorem of information theory as given in Theorem C.3 of Appendix C and to use identical derivations for finite and infinite capacity. Both is not possible with the characterization of information rate capacity considered in [2], where the more restrictive ψ-mixing condition is required such that some version of the ergodic theorem can be applied. Details on the different alternatives of information rate capacity and the impact on proving the coding theorem are studied in [3, § 10]. See also the discussion in [3, p. 57] on the requirement to modify the capacity definition such that the total ergodicity property can be employed and that simple ergodicity is not sufficient, as claimed in [10, p. 296], where discrete-time finite alphabet channels are considered.

Further improvements are based as well on the restriction in Definition 2.13 to finite alphabet block-memoryless input sources. On the one hand, we can employ the measurability condition (M) instead of (M′′), which is a significant advantage because (M) is already satisfied for the channel properties needed anyway to prove the coding theorem, where (M′′) is not. Using (M) instead of (M′′) and incorporating all associated modifications represents essentially the evolution of the results in this paper compared to those given in the Ph.D. dissertation [3, Ch. II]. On the other hand, derivations become more transparent and simple because we can omit the use of so-called standard extensions as required in [2] to incorporate

input constraints. Definition 2.13 is closely related to its operational meaning in connection with coded information transmission. Using this specific form is inspired by the work in [60]. For the special case of a discrete-time memoryless channel also in [29, p. 318/324], [14] or [61] a capacity definition based on finitely supported input measures is considered.

The weak converse in Theorem 3.2 applies to all stationary channels with time structure. No further channel properties are required. In [2] no differentiated formulations of the coding theorem and converse regarding channel properties are given. In [10, p. 303] it is already noted that the converse in [2] should hold for all stationary channels.

Due to Definition 2.11 we have a convenient flexibility in taking the robustness of a block code w. r. t. past input signals into account and input constraints are incorporated in Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 in an abstract form. In order to prove the theorems the constraints have to satisfy the regularity condition specified in (7). In [2] input constraints are characterized based on functionals as in Paragraph E.1 of Appendix E but no regularity condition is mentioned there, although the considered examples satisfy the required condition. Further note that also the monotonicity result of Lemma B.9 is employed, but the proof in [2, Appendix II] is incorrect as demonstrated with the example in Paragraph E.2. See Paragraph D.2 for a rigorous proof of the statement.

Finally, we remark that in [2] also incremental versions of the channel properties are considered by using a σ-algebra of increments at the channel output. The motivation behind this extension is a mathematically rigorous treatment of continuous-time additive white noise. For the special case of real-valued output signals we can immediately apply this modification to the model used in this paper, without any change in the proof of the coding theorem and converse.

Most literature on coding theorems for continuous-time channels is restricted to additive noise or additive Gaussian noise. In contrast, the theorems in this paper apply to general continuous-time channel models. Based on a consequent measure-theoretic description and following the path in [2] we are able to avoid the commonly used transformation of continuous-time channels proposed by Holsinger [28] and Gallager [29, Ch. 8]. As a result, we can treat continuous-time channels with the same methods applicable to discrete-time channels. It is an inherent part of our model to take interference between successive codewords into account, which is an additional advantage compared to the approach in [29, Ch. 8]. Furthermore, we incorporate input constraints in a general and flexible form. These are important arguments in favor of the path taken in this paper.

The channel properties we require to prove the coding theorem characterize a large class of practically relevant communication models. Indeed, causality is always physically justified in the context of

transmission over time. If a channel code is to be used repeatedly, stationarity is a natural assumption and total ergodicity w. r. t. $\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{E})$ is a weak condition on the channel output memory. Verifying the asymptotic input-memorylessness for specific channels, however, can be a challenging task such that it is worth to investigate more relaxed conditions for the channel input memory. A generalization of the $\bar{d}$-continuity condition considered in [10] for discrete-time finite alphabet channels might be a possible approach. Various important examples of channel models satisfying all the mentioned properties required in Theorem 3.1 are discussed in [3, Chs. IV and V] together with tools useful to study these properties.

APPENDIX

Most of the material in Appendix A to C is classical, however, tailored to the requirements of this paper. It is presented to obtain a self-contained exposition and some background.

APPENDIX A. STATIONARITY AND ERGODICITY OF MEASURES AND PROCESSES

Since stationarity and ergodicity of measures and random processes are frequently used, we restate the definitions for convenience. Further material can be found, e. g., in [3, Appendix B].

(A.1) Definition (Stationarity and Ergodicity). Let $(X, \mathcal{X})$ be the product measurable space generated by the family $\{(X_t, \mathcal{X}_t), t \in T\}$ of measurable spaces, where $(X_t, \mathcal{X}_t) = (X_0, \mathcal{X}_0)$ for all $t \in T$. Let μ be a probability measure on $(X, \mathcal{X})$ and assume that $s \in T$. Then μ is called s-stationary if

$$\mu(A) = \mu\big(\langle A\rangle_s\big)$$

holds for all $A \in \mathcal{X}$ and s-ergodic if

$$\mu(A) = 0 \qquad \text{or} \qquad \mu(A) = 1 \tag{48}$$

holds for all s-invariant sets $A \in \mathcal{X}$. The probability measure μ is called (strictly) stationary if it is s-stationary for all $s \in T$. Further, μ is called ergodic if (48) holds for all invariant sets $A \in \mathcal{X}$.

Now let $\xi = \{\xi_t, t \in T\}$ be a random process on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathrm{P})$, where the random variable ξ_t has values in the measurable space $(X_t, \mathcal{X}_t)$. Then the process ξ is called s-stationary (stationary, s-ergodic, ergodic), if the distribution P_ξ of ξ is s-stationary (stationary, s-ergodic, ergodic).

APPENDIX B. INFORMATION MEASURES FOR RANDOM VARIABLES WITH GENERAL ALPHABET

We define information measures for random variables with abstract alphabet, which is required in particular to handle continuous-time models. The general definitions go back primarily to the Russian

school of information theory starting with the work in [62][4] and continued mainly in [48][5] and [65][6]. A standard reference for information measures in general form is [66]. We collect all properties of the defined quantities relevant in this paper for convenience and prove a useful result on information rates.

Throughout this appendix, the setting will be a given abstract probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathrm{P})$. Unless stated otherwise all random variables are defined on this space and have values in arbitrary measurable spaces, specified only if required.

(B.1) Definition (Mutual information, entropy). Assume that ξ and η are random variables with values in the measurable spaces $(X, \mathcal{X})$ and $(Y, \mathcal{Y})$. Then the mutual information $I(\xi;\eta)$ between ξ and η is defined by

$$I(\xi;\eta) = \sup \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathrm{P}_{\xi,\eta}(A_i \times B_j) \log \frac{\mathrm{P}_{\xi,\eta}(A_i \times B_j)}{\mathrm{P}_{\xi}(A_i)\mathrm{P}_{\eta}(B_j)},$$

where P_{ξ}, P_{η}, and $\mathrm{P}_{\xi,\eta}$ denote the distribution of ξ, η, and (ξ,η), respectively. The supremum is taken w. r. t. all finite partitions $\{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m\}$ of X and $\{B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_n\}$ of Y with $A_i \in \mathcal{X}$ and $B_j \in \mathcal{Y}$. The entropy $H(\xi)$ of ξ is defined by

$$H(\xi) = I(\xi;\xi).$$

(B.2) Remark. The definition of mutual information for random variables with abstract alphabet is taken from [66, Sec. 2.1]. In contrast to the version given in [3, Def. 4.1] it is based directly on the space of values rather than the underlying probability space. However, using the correspondence between partitions in both spaces and the definition of image measures, it is not difficult to show that the different versions are equal.

(B.3) Theorem (*Integral form of mutual information). The mutual information between the random variables ξ and η with values in the measurable spaces $(X, \mathcal{X})$ and $(Y, \mathcal{Y})$ has the integral representation*

$$I(\xi;\eta) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_{X\times Y} \log f_{\xi,\eta} \, \mathrm{dP}_{\xi,\eta} = \int_{X\times Y} f_{\xi,\eta} \log f_{\xi,\eta} \, \mathrm{dP}_{\xi} \otimes \mathrm{P}_{\eta} & \text{if} \quad \mathrm{P}_{\xi,\eta} \ll \mathrm{P}_{\xi} \otimes \mathrm{P}_{\eta} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \tag{49}$$

[4] Russian original, see [63, No. 2] for English and [64, Ch. II] for German translation.

[5] see footnote 1 on page 5

[6] Russian original, see [66] for English and [67] for German translation.

where $f_{\xi,\eta}$ denotes the $\mathrm{P}_\xi \otimes \mathrm{P}_\eta$-density of $\mathrm{P}_{\xi,\eta}$, if $\mathrm{P}_{\xi,\eta}$ is absolutely continuous w. r. t. $\mathrm{P}_\xi \otimes \mathrm{P}_\eta$, denoted by $\mathrm{P}_{\xi,\eta} \ll \mathrm{P}_\xi \otimes \mathrm{P}_\eta$.

(B.4) Remark. The integral representation of the mutual information plays an important role. It was independently obtained in [68][7] and [70]. For a proof see also [18, Sec. 2.4].

A simple but very useful consequence of the preceding theorem is that a finite mutual information implies the absolute continuity of the joint distribution w. r. t. to the product of the marginal distributions.

(B.5) Definition (Conditional mutual information, conditional entropy). Assume that ξ, η and ζ are random variables with values in the measurable spaces $(X, \mathcal{X})$, $(Y, \mathcal{Y})$, and $(Z, \mathcal{Z})$, respectively. Then the conditional mutual information $I(\xi;\eta\,|\,\zeta)$ between ξ and η given ζ is defined by

$$I(\xi;\eta\,|\,\zeta) = \sup \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathrm{E}\Big[\mathrm{P}_{\xi,\eta|\zeta}(A_i \times B_j\,|\,\zeta) \log \frac{\mathrm{P}_{\xi,\eta|\zeta}(A_i \times B_j\,|\,\zeta)}{\mathrm{P}_{\xi|\zeta}(A_i\,|\,\zeta)\mathrm{P}_{\eta|\zeta}(B_j\,|\,\zeta)}\Big],$$

where $\mathrm{P}_{\xi|\zeta}(A_i\,|\,\cdot)$, $\mathrm{P}_{\eta|\zeta}(B_j\,|\,\cdot)$, and $\mathrm{P}_{\xi,\eta|\zeta}(A_i \times B_j\,|\,\cdot)$ denote the conditional probability of $\{\xi \in A_i\}$, $\{\eta \in B_j\}$, and $\{(\xi,\eta) \in A_i \times B_j\}$ given ζ. The supremum is taken w. r. t. all partitions $\{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m\}$ of X and $\{B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_n\}$ of Y with $A_i \in \mathcal{X}$ and $B_j \in \mathcal{Y}$. The conditional entropy $H(\xi\,|\,\zeta)$ of ξ given ζ is defined by

$$H(\xi\,|\,\zeta) = I(\xi;\xi\,|\,\zeta).$$

(B.6) Remark. This completely general definition of conditional mutual information for random variables with abstract alphabet is a form of that given in [71]. In contrast to the version given in [71] and also in [3, Def. 4.1] it is based directly on the space of values rather than the underlying probability space. Similar to the unconditional mutual information the different versions are easily shown to be equal.

The advantage of Wyners's direct definition is that it generalizes Dobrushin's indirect and restricted definition considered in [66] to cases, for which certain regular conditional probabilities do not exist [66, see translator's remarks to Ch. 3]. Conditions under which Dobrushin's version is well-defined and then equal to that of Wyner are discussed in [66, p. 55/56].

Note that we have

$$I(\xi;\eta\,|\,\zeta) = I(\xi;\eta)$$

[7]Russian original, see [69] for English and [64, Ch. I] for German translation.

if ζ is constant with probability one, i. e., the mutual information is a special case of the conditional mutual information.

Well-known properties of the information measures also hold for the general definitions introduced above. For convenience we list those employed in this paper. Please see [3, Rem. 4.8] for comments on proving these properties and on relevant literature references.

(B.7) Properties of information measures. Let ξ_1, ξ_2, ξ, η, and ζ be arbitrary random variables.

(i) *Nonnegativity:*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \le I(\xi;\eta), \qquad & I(\xi;\eta) \quad = 0 \iff \xi, \eta \text{ independent} \\ 0 \le I(\xi;\eta|\zeta), \qquad & I(\xi;\eta|\zeta) = 0 \iff (\xi - \zeta - \eta) \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *Symmetry:*

$$\begin{aligned} I(\xi;\eta) &= I(\eta;\xi) \\ I(\xi;\eta|\zeta) &= I(\eta;\xi|\zeta) \end{aligned}$$

(iii) *Chain rules:*

$$\begin{aligned} I(\xi_1,\xi_2;\eta) \quad &= I(\xi_1;\eta) \quad + I(\xi_2;\eta|\xi_1) \\ I(\xi_1,\xi_2;\eta|\zeta) &= I(\xi_1;\eta|\zeta) + I(\xi_2;\eta|\xi_1,\zeta) \end{aligned}$$

(iv) *Monotonicity:* If f is a measurable function on the space of values of ξ, then we have

$$I\big(f(\xi);\eta\big) \le I(\xi;\eta).$$

In particular,

$$I(\xi_1;\eta) \le I(\xi_1,\xi_2;\eta).$$

(v) *(Conditional) entropy and (conditional) mutual information:*

$$\begin{aligned} H(\xi) \quad &= I(\xi;\eta) \quad + H(\xi|\eta) \\ H(\xi|\zeta) &= I(\xi;\eta|\zeta) + H(\xi|\eta,\zeta) \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} H(\xi\,|\,\eta) \quad &\le H(\xi), \qquad & I(\xi;\eta) \quad &\le H(\xi), \\ H(\xi\,|\,\eta,\zeta) &\le H(\xi\,|\,\zeta), \qquad & I(\xi;\eta\,|\,\zeta) &\le H(\xi\,|\,\zeta). \end{aligned}$$

(vi) *Independence:* If ξ_1 and ξ_2 are independent, then the inequality

$$I(\xi_1,\xi_2;\eta_1,\eta_2) \ge I(\xi_1;\eta_1) + I(\xi_2;\eta_2).$$

holds. Equality holds if (ξ_1,η_1) and (ξ_2,η_2) are independent.

(vii) *Entropy of random variable with finite alphabet:* If ξ is a discrete random variable with finite alphabet of size m, then

$$H(\xi) \le \log m$$

with equality if and only if all values have the same probability $1/m$.

We will use the following, maybe most basic and natural version of (mutual) information rate as introduced in [66, eq. (5.4.1)].

(B.8) Definition (Information rate). The (mutual) information rate $\bar{I}(\xi;\eta)$ between the random processes $\xi = \{\xi_t, t \in T\}$ and $\eta = \{\eta_t, t \in T\}$ is defined by

$$\bar{I}(\xi;\eta) = \lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{1}{s} I(\xi_0^s;\eta_0^s),$$

if the limit exists.

(B.9) Lemma (*Information rate for stationary random sequences, one being independent).* *Let $\xi = \{\xi_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be a sequence of independent and $\eta = \{\eta_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be a sequence of arbitrary random variables such that the pair sequence $\{(\xi_k,\eta_k), k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is stationary. Then*

(i) the sequence $\{n^{-1} I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is monotonically increasing,

(ii) the sequence $\{I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is superadditive, i.e., for all $l, m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$I(\xi_0^l;\eta_0^l) + I(\xi_0^m;\eta_0^m) \le I(\xi_0^{l+m};\eta_0^{l+m}),$$

and (i) *as well as* (ii) *imply that the information rate $\bar{I}(\xi;\eta)$ exists and is given by*

$$\bar{I}(\xi;\eta) = \sup_{n\ge 1} \frac{1}{n} I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n).$$

(B.10) Remark. The lemma is a useful basic result, which is employed in the proof of the central coding theorem (converse) for abstract channels with time structure. It is a special case of a more general version shown in [3, Lem. 4.13]. Note, that the monotonicity result is used also in [2] to prove a coding theorem for continuous-time channels. Further, it is employed in [72] and [73]. However, the proof given in [2, Appendix II] regarding the monotonicity is not correct as shown with a counterexample in Paragraph E.2 of Appendix E. Since a complete proof has seemingly not been published yet in the literature it is given in Paragraph D.2 of Appendix D.

(B.11) Lemma (*Information rate for stationary sequences, one with finite alphabet). Let* $\xi = \{\xi_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ *and* $\eta = \{\eta_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ *be random sequences such that the pair sequence* $\{(\xi_k, \eta_k), k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ *is stationary. Further assume that the random variables* ξ_k *have a finite alphabet. Then the information rate* $\bar{I}(\xi;\eta)$ *exists and is given by*

$$\bar{I}(\xi;\eta) = I(\xi_1;\eta\,|\,\xi_-^0). \tag{50}$$

In particular, $\bar{I}(\xi;\eta)$ *is finite.*

(B.12) Remark. The proof of the existence of $\bar{I}(\xi;\eta)$ and of the equality (50) is identical to the proof of the first part of [66, Thm. 6.1.1], where it is assumed that also the random variables η_k have a finite alphabet. The inequalities in (B.7.v) imply

$$I(\xi_1;\eta\,|\,\xi_-^0) \le H(\xi_1\,|\,\xi_-^0) \le H(\xi_1) \tag{51}$$

and $H(\xi_1)$ is finite due to (B.7.vii). Thus $\bar{I}(\xi;\eta)$ is finite.

Appendix C. Tools to Prove Achievability and Converse

(C.1) Lemma (*Feinstein's lemma). Suppose* P_1 *is a probability measure on the measurable space* $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$ *and* K *is a Markov kernel from* $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$ *to the measurable space* $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$*. Further, let* P *denote the probability measure induced by* P_1 *and* K*, i. e., the measure on the product space* $(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}_2)$ *defined by*

$$\mathrm{P}(F_1 \times F_2) = \int_{F_1} K(\omega_1, F_2)\,\mathrm{dP}_1(\omega_1), \quad F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1, \quad F_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2.$$

We assume that P *has a* $\mathrm{P}_1 \otimes \mathrm{P}_2$*-density, say* f*, where* P_2 *denotes the marginal measure of* P *on* $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$*. Let* $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $m \in \mathbb{N}$ *be arbitrary and consider the set*

$$G_\gamma = \{f > \mathrm{e}^\gamma\} = \{(\omega_1, \omega_2) \in \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 : f(\omega_1, \omega_2) > \mathrm{e}^\gamma\}.$$

Then there exist elements $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \in \Omega_1$ *and a partition* $\{B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_m\}$ *of* Ω_2 *with* $B_i \in \mathcal{F}_2$ *such that*

$$K(a_i, B_i^{\mathrm{c}}) < m\mathrm{e}^{-\gamma} + \mathrm{P}(G_\gamma^{\mathrm{c}}) \tag{52}$$

holds for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$*.*

(C.2) Remark. Feinstein's lemma is a tool to prove coding theorems for channels with memory in a transparent way. This version of the lemma is what we require in the proof of the coding theorem. The original lemma is published in [74]. A generalization is given in [3, Lem. 8.1] together with historical notes and a discussion on various forms of the lemma in [3, Rmk. 8.2]. A proof of the version given above can be found in [52, Sec. 14.2].

To prove a coding theorem using Feinstein's lemma it is necessary to control the upper bound of the (conditional) probability in (52), where the probability will correspond to the decoding error. This is possible with the help of the ergodic theorem of information theory given next for a quite simple special case, which turn out to be sufficient in the context of this paper.

(C.3) Theorem (*Ergodic theorem of information theory for stationary sequences, one with finite alphabet). Assume that* $\xi = \{\xi_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ *and* $\eta = \{\eta_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ *are random sequences on the probability space* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathrm{P})$*. Further assume that the pair sequence* $\{(\xi_k, \eta_k), k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ *is stationary and ergodic and that the random variables* ξ_k *have a finite alphabet. Then for any* $\epsilon > 0$ *we have*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n}\log f^{(n)}\big(\xi_0^n, \eta_0^n\big) - \bar{I}(\xi;\eta)\right| \geq \epsilon\right) = 0, \tag{53}$$

where $f^{(n)}$ *denotes the* $\mathrm{P}_{\xi_0^n} \otimes \mathrm{P}_{\eta_0^n}$*-density of* $\mathrm{P}_{\xi_0^n, \eta_0^n}$*. By* $\mathrm{P}_{\xi_0^n, \eta_0^n}$*,* $\mathrm{P}_{\xi_0^n}$*, and* $\mathrm{P}_{\eta_0^n}$ *we denote the distribution of* (ξ_0^n, η_0^n)*,* ξ_0^n*, and* η_0^n*, respectively.*

(C.4) Remark. Due to Lemma B.11 the information rate $\bar{I}(\xi;\eta)$ exists and is finite and due to the second inequality in (B.7.iv) a finite information rate $\bar{I}(\xi;\eta)$ implies the mutual information $I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n)$ is finite for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, $f^{(n)}$ exists according to the comment in Remark B.4 such that (53) is well-defined.

This version of the ergodic theorem is precisely what we required to prove the coding theorem. The proof of Theorem C.3 is identical to the proof of [66, Th. 6.4.1], where it is assumed that also the random variables η_k have a finite alphabet. That we can follow the proof given there prerequires Dobrushin's version of the involved conditional mutual informations (see Remark B.6) including the so called conditional information densities exist. Using (B.7.vii) and the second inequality in (B.7.v) together with the comments in Remark B.4 and [66, p. 56, first paragraph] imply the existence of the conditional mutual informations in the sense of Dobrushin. As in (51) we obtain that they are finite, which implies according to [66, p. 29] the existences of the corresponding conditional information densities.

A generalized version of the ergodic theorem is given in [66, Th. 8.2.1] or [3, Th. 8.4]. Historical notes and a discussion on various forms of the ergodic theorem is given in [3, Rmk. 8.5].

Fano's inequality, originally published in [75], is a standard tool to prove a weak converse of a coding theorem. See [76, p. 81] or [29, p. 78–79] for a proof of this result.

(C.5) Lemma (*Fano's inequality). Let ξ and η be discrete random variables on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathrm{P})$ with common finite alphabet of size $m > 1$. Then the conditional entropy $H(\xi\,|\,\eta)$ of ξ given η satisfies the inequality*

$$h_m(p_e) \geq H(\xi\,|\,\eta),$$

where $p_e = \mathrm{P}(\xi \neq \eta)$ and the function h_m is defined for integers $m > 1$ by

$$h_m(x) = x\log(m-1) - x\log x - (1-x)\log(1-x), \qquad x \in [0,1]. \tag{54}$$

Appendix D. Proofs of Lemmas

(D.1) Proof of Lemma 2.8. Let $G \in \mathfrak{C}_Y$ be arbitrary. Then there exist $u < v \in T$ such that $G \in [\mathcal{Y}_u^v]$. Further, let $(A, \mathcal{A}) \in \mathfrak{A}(\mathcal{E})$ be an arbitrary product measurable space as defined in (9), where $s \in T_+$ is the time duration of the signals in A_0. Then there exist $i < j \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $is < u$ and $js > v$ such that $G \in [\mathcal{Y}_{is}^{js}]$. We consider $\kappa(\cdot, G)$ as function on $A \subset X$ and fix an arbitrary signal $a = \{a_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}\} \in \times_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\langle A_0\rangle_{ks} = A$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define the function g_n on A by

$$g_n(x) = \kappa\big((a_-^{i-n}, x_{i-n}^+), G\big),$$

for all $x = \{x_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}\} \in A$, where $a_-^{i-n} = \{a_k, k \leq i-n\}$ denotes the projection of a onto A_-^{i-n} and $x_{i-n}^+ = \{x_k, k > i-n\}$ denotes the projection of x onto A_{i-n}^+.

Due to the definition of g_n and the causality of κ in combination with $G \in [\mathcal{Y}_{is}^{js}]$ we have that $g_n(x)$ does only depend on coordinates of x with index $i-n < k < j$. In addition, the product σ-algebra $\mathcal{A}_{i-n}^{j}$ is equal to the power set $2^{A_{i-n}^{j}}$, since A_0 is a finite set. Thus, g_n is $[\mathcal{A}_{i-n}^{j}]$-measurable and therefore $\mathcal{A}$-measurable. Since κ is asymptotically input-memoryless for the signal set E' we further have

$$g_n \xrightarrow[(n\to\infty)]{} \kappa(\cdot, G)$$

pointwise for all $x \in A$. As a standard result from measure theory we obtain from this convergence and the $\mathcal{A}$-measurability of g_n for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the $\mathcal{A}$-measurability of $\kappa(\cdot, G)$. As $G \in \mathfrak{C}_Y$ and $(A, \mathcal{A}) \in \mathfrak{A}(\mathcal{E})$ were chosen arbitrary, we obtain that κ satisfies the condition (M) w. r. t. $\mathcal{E}$.

(D.2) Proof of Lemma B.9. In the subsequent proof, if $m > n$ and ξ_m^n is the condition in a conditional mutual information, then this denotes the corresponding unconditional mutual information, for example $I(\eta_1; \eta_2 \,|\, \xi_1^0) = I(\eta_1; \eta_2)$.

(i) *Proof of (B.9.i).* First assume that $I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n) < \infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. To show that the sequence $\{n^{-1} I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is monotonically increasing, we show that

$$\frac{1}{n+1} I(\xi_0^{n+1}; \eta_0^{n+1}) - \frac{1}{n} I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n) \;\geq\; 0 \tag{55}$$

holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that we have the identity

$$\begin{aligned} n\, I(\xi_0^{n+1}; \eta_0^{n+1}) - (n+1)\, I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n) = \\ \sum_{k=1}^{n} (n-k+1)\, I(\xi_k; \eta_{n+1} \,|\, \eta_0^n, \xi_0^{k-1}) \\ + \sum_{k=2}^{n+1} (k-1)\, I(\xi_k; \xi_1, \eta_1 \,|\, \eta_1^{n+1}, \xi_1^{k-1}). \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

Then, dividing (56) by $n(n+1)$ and using the nonnegativity of the conditional mutual information given in (B.7.i) yields (55). To obtain (56) we first apply the chain rules given in (B.7.iii) repeatedly to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & n\, I(\xi_0^{n+1}; \eta_0^{n+1}) \qquad\qquad - (n+1)\, I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n) \\ = \; & n \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} I(\xi_k; \eta_0^{n+1} \,|\, \xi_0^{k-1}) - (n+1) \sum_{k=1}^{n} I(\xi_k; \eta_0^n \,|\, \xi_0^{k-1}). \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

We can rewrite (57) as

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{k=1}^{n}(n-k+1)\Big[I(\xi_k;\eta_0^{n+1}\,|\,\xi_0^{k-1})-I(\xi_k;\eta_0^{n}\,|\,\xi_0^{k-1})\Big]\\+&\sum_{k=2}^{n+1}(k-1)\Big[I(\xi_k;\eta_0^{n+1}\,|\,\xi_0^{k-1})-I(\xi_{k-1};\eta_0^{n}\,|\,\xi_0^{k-2})\Big],\end{aligned}\tag{58}$$

which can be seen by expanding the sums in (57) in the following form:

k			
1	$n\,I(\xi_1;\eta_0^{n+1})$	$-\quad n\,I(\xi_1;\eta_0^{n})$	$(*)$
2	$+\quad I(\xi_2;\eta_0^{n+1}\,\vert\,\xi_1)$	$-\quad I(\xi_1;\eta_0^{n})$	$(\circ)$
	$+\,(n-1)\,I(\xi_2;\eta_0^{n+1}\,\vert\,\xi_1)$	$-\,(n-1)\,I(\xi_2;\eta_0^{n}\,\vert\,\xi_1)$	$(*)$
3	$+\quad 2\,I(\xi_3;\eta_0^{n+1}\,\vert\,\xi_0^2)$	$-\quad 2\,I(\xi_2;\eta_0^{n}\,\vert\,\xi_1)$	$(\circ)$
	$+\,(n-2)\,I(\xi_3;\eta_0^{n+1}\,\vert\,\xi_0^2)$	$-\,(n-2)\,I(\xi_3;\eta_0^{n}\,\vert\,\xi_0^2)$	$(*)$
$\cdots$	$\cdots$	$-\quad 3\,I(\xi_3;\eta_0^{n}\,\vert\,\xi_0^2)$	$(\circ)$
	$\cdots$	$\cdots$	
$n-1$	$+\,(n-2)\,I(\xi_{n-1};\eta_0^{n+1}\,\vert\,\xi_0^{n-2})$	$\cdots$	$(\circ)$
	$+\quad 2\,I(\xi_{n-1};\eta_0^{n+1}\,\vert\,\xi_0^{n-2})$	$-\quad 2\,I(\xi_{n-1};\eta_0^{n}\,\vert\,\xi_0^{n-2})$	$(*)$
n	$+\,(n-1)\,I(\xi_n\quad;\eta_0^{n+1}\,\vert\,\xi_0^{n-1})$	$-\,(n-1)\,I(\xi_{n-1};\eta_0^{n}\,\vert\,\xi_0^{n-2})$	$(\circ)$
	$+\quad I(\xi_n\quad;\eta_0^{n+1}\,\vert\,\xi_0^{n-1})$	$-\quad I(\xi_n\quad;\eta_0^{n}\,\vert\,\xi_0^{n-1})$	$(*)$
$n+1$	$+\quad n\,I(\xi_{n+1};\eta_0^{n+1}\,\vert\,\xi_0^{n})$	$-\quad n\,I(\xi_n\quad;\eta_0^{n}\,\vert\,\xi_0^{n-1})$	$(\circ)$

Applying the chain rules to the rows marked by $(*)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}&(n-k+1)\Big[I(\xi_k;\eta_0^{n+1}\,|\,\xi_0^{k-1})-I(\xi_k;\eta_0^{n}\,|\,\xi_0^{k-1})\Big]\\&=(n-k+1)\;\;I(\xi_k;\eta_{n+1}\,|\,\eta_0^{n},\xi_0^{k-1})\end{aligned}\tag{59}$$

for $k=1,2,\ldots,n$. Applying the chain rules to the rows marked by $(\circ)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}&(k-1)\Big[I(\xi_k;\eta_0^{n+1}\,|\,\xi_0^{k-1})-I(\xi_{k-1};\eta_0^{n}\,|\,\xi_0^{k-2})\Big]\\&=(k-1)\Big[I(\xi_k;\xi_1,\eta_0^{n+1}\,|\,\xi_1^{k-1})-I(\xi_k;\xi_1\,|\,\xi_1^{k-1})-I(\xi_k;\eta_1^{n+1}\,|\,\xi_1^{k-1})\Big]\\&=(k-1)\Big[I(\xi_k;\xi_1,\eta_1\,|\,\eta_1^{n+1},\xi_1^{k-1})-I(\xi_k;\xi_1\,|\,\xi_1^{k-1})\Big]\\&=(k-1)\;\;I(\xi_k;\xi_1,\eta_1\,|\,\eta_1^{n+1},\xi_1^{k-1})\end{aligned}\tag{60}$$

for $k = 2, 3, \ldots, n+1$. For the first equality we have additionally used

$$I(\xi_{k-1}; \eta_0^n \,|\, \xi_0^{k-2}) = I(\xi_k; \eta_1^{n+1} \,|\, \xi_1^{k-1}),$$

which follows from the stationarity of the pair sequence $\{(\xi_k, \eta_k), k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. For (60) we have used

$$I(\xi_k; \xi_1 \,|\, \xi_1^{k-1}) = I(\xi_1^k; \xi_1) - I(\xi_1^{k-1}; \xi_1) = 0,$$

where the first equality follows again from the chain rule and the second holds due to the first relation in (B.7.i) in combination with the condition in the lemma that $\xi = \{\xi_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is an independent sequence of random variables. Now combining (57)–(60) yields the identity in (56). The shown monotonicity clearly implies

$$\bar{I}(\xi; \eta) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n) = \sup_{n\geq 1} \frac{1}{n} I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n). \tag{61}$$

The above derivations do not contain any indeterminate expression since from the initial assumption of the proof we have $I(\xi_0^{n+1}; \eta_0^{n+1}) < \infty$, which implies together with (B.7.iv) and the chain rules the finiteness of all considered information quantities. Now let us consider the case when the assumption $I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n) < \infty$ is not true for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, due to (B.7.iv) there exists an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n) < \infty$ for all $n < n_0$ and $I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n) = \infty$ for all $n \geq n_0$. In this situation inequality (55) is valid for all $n < n_0$, because for all $n < n_0 - 1$ we have the same situation as before and for $n = n_0 - 1$ we have $\infty \geq 0$. If $n \geq n_0$, then we have $n^{-1} I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n) = \infty$. (If $n_0 = 1$ or $n_0 = 2$ the previous discussion simplifies accordingly.) Thus, we have the monotonicity of the sequence $\{n^{-1} I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Finally, (61) still holds since both sides are infinite. This completes the proof of the first part of Lemma B.9.

(ii) *Proof of (B.9.ii).* For $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(\xi_0^{m+n}; \eta_0^{m+n}) &= I(\xi_0^m, \xi_m^{m+n}; \eta_0^m, \eta_m^{m+n}) \\ &\geq I(\xi_0^m; \eta_0^m) \,+\, I(\xi_m^{m+n}; \eta_m^{m+n}) \\ &= I(\xi_0^m; \eta_0^m) \,+\, I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n). \end{aligned}$$

The inequality follows from (B.7.vi) in combination with the condition in the lemma that $\xi = \{\xi_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is an independent sequence of random variables. The last equality follows from the stationarity of the pair sequence $\{(\xi_k, \eta_k), k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Thus, the sequence $\{I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is superadditive. If $I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n) < \infty$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$\bar{I}(\xi;\eta) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n) = \sup_{n\geq 1} \frac{1}{n} I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n) \tag{62}$$

follows from Fekete's lemma given, e. g., in [77, p. 3] Otherwise, both sides of (62) are infinite. (See the discussion at the end of part (i).) This completes the proof of the second part of Lemma B.9.

(D.3) Proof of Lemma 2.15.

(i) *Proof of (17).* Let us define $\gamma = \sup_{s\in T_+} C_s/s$ and let $\epsilon > 0$. If $\gamma < \infty$ we put $\rho = \gamma - \epsilon$ and if $\gamma = \infty$ let $\rho > 0$ be arbitrary. Then due to the definition of γ and C_s in Definition 2.13 there exists in both cases an $s_0 \in T_+$ and a channel input probability space $(A, \mathcal{A}, \mu) \in \mathfrak{P}(E_{s_0})$ such that

$$\rho \leq \frac{1}{s_0} I\big(\xi_0^{s_0};\eta_0^{s_0}\big). \tag{63}$$

For all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ we denote by

$$\alpha_{k+1} = \xi_{ks_0}^{(k+1)s_0} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \beta_{k+1} = \eta_{ks_0}^{(k+1)s_0} \tag{64}$$

the projections from $A \times Y$ onto $A_k = \langle A_0\rangle_{ks_0}$ and $Y_{ks}^{(k+1)s}$, respectively. Then $\alpha = \{\alpha_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and $\beta = \{\beta_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ are random sequences on the channel input-output probability space $(A\times Y, \mathcal{A}\otimes\mathcal{Y}, \mu\kappa)$, where the probability measure $\mu\kappa$ is well-defined since we assume that κ satisfies the measurability condition (M) w. r. t. $\mathcal{E}$.

From $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E_{s_0})$ it follows that $\{\alpha_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is an i.i.d.-sequence of random variables. The channel κ is assumed to be stationary so that it is in particular s_0-stationary according to (2.7.i). Together with the s_0-stationarity of μ we obtain from Lemma 2.9 the s_0-stationarity of the channel input-output probability measure $\mu\kappa$. Therefore, the pair sequence $\{(\alpha_k, \beta_k), k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ of projections is stationary. Applying Lemma B.9 yields

$$\frac{1}{s_0} I(\alpha_1;\beta_1) \leq \frac{1}{ns_0} I(\alpha_0^n;\beta_0^n) \tag{65}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The probability measure μ_0 on $(A_0, \mathcal{A}_0) = \big(\{\mathtt{a}_{[1]}, \mathtt{a}_{[2]}, \ldots, \mathtt{a}_{[\mathtt{M}]}\}, 2^{A_0}\big)$ from which the product measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E_{s_0})$ is built as specified in (10) has the form

$$\mu_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{M} p_i \delta_{\mathtt{a}_{[i]}}. \tag{66}$$

Then for fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the product measure

$$\mu_0' = \bigotimes_{k=0}^{n-1} \langle \mu_0 \rangle_{ks_0} = \sum_{j=1}^{M^n} p_j' \delta_{\mathtt{a}'_{[\mathtt{j}]}},$$

with $p_j' = p_{i_0} \cdot p_{i_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot p_{i_{n-1}}$ and $\mathtt{a}'_{[\mathtt{j}]} = (\mathtt{a}_{[\mathtt{i}_0]}, \mathtt{a}_{[\mathtt{i}_1]}, \ldots, \mathtt{a}_{[\mathtt{i}_{n-1}]})$ is a probability measure on $(A_0', \mathcal{A}_0')$, where $A_0' = \times_{k=0}^{n-1} \langle A_0 \rangle_{ks_0} = \{\mathtt{a}'_{[\mathtt{1}]}, \ldots, \mathtt{a}'_{[\mathtt{M^n}]}\}$ and $\mathcal{A}_0' = \bigotimes_{k=0}^{n-1} \langle \mathcal{A}_0 \rangle_{ks_0} = 2^{A_0'}$. We have the identity

$$(A, \mathcal{A}, \mu) = \left(\underset{l \in \mathbb{Z}}{\times} \langle A_0' \rangle_{lns_0} \ , \ \bigotimes_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle \mathcal{A}_0' \rangle_{lns_0} \ , \ \bigotimes_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle \mu_0' \rangle_{lns_0} \right)$$

and from $\mathtt{a}'_{[\mathtt{j}]} \in \times_{k=0}^{n-1} \langle E_{s_0} \rangle_{ks_0}$ together with the assumption that the family $\mathcal{E}$ of input constraints satisfies the regularity condition (7) we obtain $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E_{ns_0})$. This implies for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\frac{1}{ns_0} I(\alpha_0^n; \beta_0^n) \leq \frac{1}{ns_0} C_{ns_0} \tag{67}$$

and in combination with (63) and (65) we obtain

$$\rho \leq \limsup_{s \to \infty} \frac{1}{s} C_s \leq \gamma,$$

where the second inequality is obvious from the definition of the limit superior. This proves (17) since ρ was chosen arbitrarily if $\gamma = \infty$ and since we defined $\rho = \gamma - \epsilon$ with $\epsilon > 0$ being arbitrary if $\gamma < \infty$.

(ii) *Proof of (18).* Let us define $\gamma^* = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})} \bar{I}(\mu)$ and let $\epsilon > 0$. If $\gamma^* < \infty$ we put $\rho^* = \gamma^* - \epsilon$ and if $\gamma^* = \infty$ let $\rho^* > 0$ be arbitrary. Due to the definition of γ^* there exists in both cases an $s_0 \in T_+$ and a $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E_{s_0}) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ such that

$$\rho^* \leq \bar{I}(\mu) \leq C. \tag{68}$$

Indeed, using the notation of part (i) we have

$$\bar{I}(\mu) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{ns_0} I(\xi_0^{ns_0}; \eta_0^{ns_0}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{ns_0} I(\alpha_0^n; \beta_0^n) = \frac{1}{s_0} \bar{I}(\alpha; \beta), \tag{69}$$

where the existence of the information rate $\bar{I}(\alpha; \beta)$ follows from Lemma B.9, which can be applied due to the properties of the random sequences α and β derived in part (i). Further, using (67) and the representation $C = \sup_{s \in T_+} C_s/s$ yields

$$\frac{1}{ns_0} I(\alpha_0^n; \beta_0^n) \leq \frac{1}{ns_0} C_{ns_0} \leq C \tag{70}$$

and together with (69) the second inequality in (68). In combination with the definition of ρ^* this implies

the inequality

$$\gamma^* \le C. \tag{71}$$

Now consider the setup at the beginning of part (i). Then we have due to (63), (65), and (69)

$$\rho \le \bar{I}(\mu) \le \gamma^*$$

and from the definition of ρ follows

$$C \le \gamma^*. \tag{72}$$

Finally, combining (71) and (72) yields (18).

APPENDIX E. EXAMPLES

(E.1) Amplitude and average power constraint. Assume that $s \in T_+$. Often a constraint set $E_s \subset X_0^s$ has the form[8]

$$E_s = \big\{\Phi_s \le 1\big\} = \big\{x \in X_0^s : \Phi_s(x) \le 1\big\}, \tag{73}$$

where Φ_s is a nonnegative functional on X_0^s, also called cost function. Let ϕ be a nonnegative function on X_0 and assume that ϕ also denotes the identically defined function on X_t for all $t \in T$. In our first example the functional Φ_s is given by

$$\Phi_s(x) = \sup_{t\in(0,s]} \phi(x_t), \tag{74}$$

for all $x = \big\{x_t, t \in (0,s]\big\} \in X_0^s$ and in the second example Φ_s has the form

$$\Phi_s(x) = \frac{1}{s}\int_{(0,s]} \phi(x_t)\,\mathrm{d}\lambda(t). \tag{75}$$

Here we denote by λ the counting measure on the integers if $T = \mathbb{Z}$ and the one-dimensional Lebesgue measure if $T = \mathbb{R}$. This allows us a common notation for the discrete- and continuous-time case. In the continuous-time case the integral is defined only for signals $x \in X_0^s$ for which the nonnegative function $\{\phi(x_t), t \in (0,s]\}$ is Lebesgue-measurable. For the remaining signals in X_0^s we set $\Phi_s(x)$ equal to an arbitrary constant larger than 1. If we have real-valued input signals, i. e., $X_0 = \mathbb{R}$, and $\phi(x_t) = |x_t|$,

[8]Without loss of generality we can choose 1 as upper bound in (73) because we can normalize the inequality.

then (74) represents an amplitude constraint. For real-valued input signals and $\phi(x_t) = x_t^2$, the functional in (75) represents the important average energy or power constraint.

Consider now the family $\mathcal{E} = \{E_s \subset X_0^s, s \in T_+\}$ of constraint sets, where E_s is given in (73). In the first example with Φ_s as in (74), we have for any $s \in T_+$

$$E_s = \underset{t\in(0,s]}{\times} J_t,$$

which implies for the sets introduced in Paragraph 2.5

$$\begin{aligned} E_s^* = E_s' &= E' \\ &= \underset{t\in T}{\times} J_t, \end{aligned}$$

where J_t is for all $t \in T$ the inverse image of the real interval $[0, 1]$ w. r. t. ϕ. We further obtain for any $u, v \in T_+$

$$E_u \times \left\langle E_v \right\rangle_u = E_{u+v},$$

such that the regularity condition (7) holds even with equality.

The second example with Φ_s as in (75) also satisfies the regularity condition. Given the signals $\hat{x} = \{\hat{x}_t, t \in (0, u]\} \in E_u$ and $\check{x} = \{\check{x}_t, t \in (0, v]\} \in E_v$, we have for the composed signal $x = (\hat{x}, \langle\check{x}\rangle_u) = \{x_t, t \in (0, u + v]\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \int\limits_{(0,u+v]} \phi(x_t)\,\mathrm{d}\lambda(t) &= \int\limits_{(0,u]} \phi(x_t)\,\mathrm{d}\lambda(t) + \int\limits_{(u,u+v]} \phi(x_t)\,\mathrm{d}\lambda(t) \\ &= \int\limits_{(0,u]} \phi(\hat{x}_t)\,\mathrm{d}\lambda(t) + \int\limits_{(0,v]} \phi(\check{x}_t)\,\mathrm{d}\lambda(t) \\ &\leq u + v, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (8) and therefore (7). Furthermore, we can show that the set

$$F = \left\{ x = \{x_t, t \in T\} \in X : \limsup_{s\to\infty} \frac{1}{2s} \int_{(-s,s]} \phi(x_t)\,\mathrm{d}\lambda(t) \leq 1 \right\}$$

is shift-invariant and that

$$E' \subset F$$

holds, with E' as given in (6). For example, if the input signals are real-valued and $\phi(x_t) = x_t^2$, then F

represents the set of all asymptotically power limited signals with infinite duration.

(E.2) Counterexample to monotonicity proof in [2, Appendix II]. Let us adopt the notation and the conditions of Lemma B.9. Due to (B.7.i) and (B.7.iv) the sequence $\{I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n), n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is nonnegative and monotonically increasing and due to its superadditivity we have $I(\xi_1;\eta_1)\le I(\xi_0^2;\eta_0^2)-I(\xi_1;\eta_1)$. Therefore, the convexity of the sequence $\{I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n), n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ would imply that the sequence $\{n^{-1}I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n), n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is monotonically increasing. This is the argument used in [2, Appendix II]. That it does not work is shown below, where we give a strictly concave example under the conditions of Lemma B.9.

Note, that the sequence $\{I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n), n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is convex if

$$I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n)\;\le\;\frac{1}{2}\Big[I(\xi_0^{n-1};\eta_0^{n-1})+I(\xi_0^{n+1};\eta_0^{n+1})\Big] \tag{76}$$

or equivalently if

$$0\;\le\;\Big[I(\xi_0^{n+1};\eta_0^{n+1})-I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n)\Big]-\Big[I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n)-I(\xi_0^{n-1};\eta_0^{n-1})\Big] \tag{77}$$

holds for all $n=2,3,\ldots$. It is strictly convex if the inequality in (76) or (77) is sharpened to a strict inequality. Furthermore, the sequence $\{I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n), n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is (strictly) concave if the sequence $\{-I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n), n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is (strictly) convex.

To evaluate the difference on the right-hand side of (77) we rewrite $I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n)&=I(\xi_1;\eta_1)+I(\xi_1^n;\eta_1^n)+I(\xi_1^n;\xi_1,\eta_1\,|\,\eta_1^n)-I(\xi_1;\xi_1^n)+I(\xi_1;\eta_1^n\,|\,\eta_1)\\&=I(\xi_1;\eta_1)+I(\xi_0^{n-1};\eta_0^{n-1})+I(\xi_1,\eta_1;\xi_1^n,\eta_1^n)-I(\eta_1;\eta_1^n).\end{aligned}$$

The first equality follows from applying the chain rule of mutual information given in (B.7.iii) several times. For the second equality we use the stationarity of the pair sequence $\{(\xi_k,\eta_k), k\in\mathbb{Z}\}$, the independence of ξ_1 and ξ_1^n together with (B.7.i), and again the chain rule of mutual information. Using this representation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big[I(\xi_0^{n+1};\eta_0^{n+1})-I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n)\Big]-\Big[I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n)-I(\xi_0^{n-1};\eta_0^{n-1})\Big]\\&=\Big(I(\xi_1,\eta_1;\xi_1^{n+1},\eta_1^{n+1})-I(\xi_1,\eta_1;\xi_1^n,\eta_1^n)\Big)-\Big(I(\eta_1;\eta_1^{n+1})-I(\eta_1;\eta_1^n)\Big)\\&=I(\xi_1,\eta_1;\xi_{n+1},\eta_{n+1}\,|\,\xi_1^n,\eta_1^n)-I(\eta_1;\eta_{n+1}\,|\,\eta_1^n),\end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

where the last equality follows from the chain rule (B.7.iii). Thus, we can use the difference in (78) to analyze the convexity or concavity of the sequence $\{I(\xi_0^n;\eta_0^n), n\in\mathbb{N}\}$. Below we give an example

where the difference is negative for all $n = 2, 3, \ldots$, i. e., where the sequence $\{I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is strictly concave.

Let $\{\xi_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be an i.i.d.-sequence, where ξ_0 has a Bernoulli distribution with the parameter $q = \mathrm{P}(\xi_0 = 1)$. Assume that the random sequence $\{\eta_k, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is defined by the relation

$$\eta_k = \xi_k \oplus \xi_{k-1} \tag{79}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $\oplus$ denotes addition modulo 2. The stationarity of the pair sequence $\{(\xi_k, \eta_k), k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is an immediate consequence of this construction. Thus the conditions of Lemma B.9 are satisfied.

It is not difficult to see that we have the Markov chain $\big((\xi_1, \eta_1) - (\xi_1^n, \eta_1^n) - (\xi_{n+1}, \eta_{n+1})\big)$, which implies due to (B.7.i) that the first term in (78) is zero such that

$$I(\xi_1, \eta_1; \xi_{n+1}, \eta_{n+1} \,|\, \xi_1^n, \eta_1^n) - I(\eta_1; \eta_{n+1} \,|\, \eta_1^n) = -I(\eta_1; \eta_{n+1} \,|\, \eta_1^n) \le 0$$

holds for all $m = 2, 3, \ldots$, since the conditional mutual information is nonnegative. Thus, the sequence $\{I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is concave. It is strictly concave if $I(\eta_1; \eta_{n+1} \,|\, \eta_1^n) > 0$, i. e., if the Markov chain relation $\big(\eta_1 - \eta_1^n - \eta_{n+1}\big)$ does not hold. That this is the case for parameter $q \in (0, 1/2) \cup (1/2, 1)$ is most easily obtained considering the conditional probabilities for the sequence of all zeros. This example shows the insufficiency of the convexity argument to prove the monotonicity of the sequence $\{n^{-1} I(\xi_0^n; \eta_0^n), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. The channel representation of this example, which is stationary and memoryless (see Remark 4.7) is discussed in [3, Par. 16.6].

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors wish to thank Holger Boche for helpful discussions and valuable comments, in particular regarding the optimistic and pessimistic view on coding capacities as considered in Remark 3.3.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Ahlswede, *Transmitting and Gaining Data – Rudolf Ahlswede's Lectures on Information Theory 2*, A. Ahlswede, I. Althöfer, C. Deppe, and U. Tamm, Eds. Springer, 2015.

[2] T. T. Kadota and A. D. Wyner, "Coding theorem for stationary, asymptotically memoryless, continuous-time channels," *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 1603–1611, 1972.

[3] M. Mittelbach, "Coding theorem and memory conditions for abstract channels with time structure," Ph.D. dissertation, Lehrstuhl Theoretische Nachrichtentechnik, Fakultät Elektrotechnik und Informationstechnik, TU Dresden, 2014. [Online]. Available: http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:bsz:14-qucosa-168302

[4] A. I. Khinchin, *Mathematical Foundations of Information Theory*. Dover, 1957.

[5] K. Takano, "On the basic theorems of information theory," *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 53–77, 1957.

[6] A. Feinstein, "On the coding theorem and its converse for finite-memory channels," *Information and Control*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 25–44, 1959.

[7] J. Wolfowitz, "A note on the strong converse of the coding theorem for the general discrete finite-memory channel," *Information and Control*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 89–93, 1960.

[8] R. L. Adler, "Ergodic and mixing properties of infinite memory channels," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 924–930, 1961.

[9] E. Pfaffelhuber, "Channels with asymptotically decreasing memory and anticipation," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 379–385, 1971.

[10] R. M. Gray and D. S. Ornstein, "Block coding for discrete stationary $\bar{d}$-continuous noisy channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 292–306, 1979.

[11] M. Rosenblatt-Roth, "The concept of entropy in probability theory and its application in the theory of information transmission through communication channels," *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 212–235, 1964.

[12] ——, "Approximations in information theory," in *Proceedings of the Fifth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1: Statistics*. University of California Press, 1967, pp. 545–564.

[13] K. Jacobs, "Über Kanäle vom Dichtetypus," *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, vol. 78, no. 1, pp. 151–170, 1962.

[14] T. J. Wagner, "A coding theorem for abstract memoryless channels," *Information and Control*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 489–498, 1968.

[15] U. Augustin, "Gedächtnisfreie Kanäle für diskrete Zeit," *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, vol. 6, pp. 10–61, 1966.

[16] J. H. B. Kemperman, "On the optimum rate of transmitting information," *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 2156–2177, 1969.

[17] R. L. Dobrushin, "Mathematical problems in the Shannon theory of optimal coding of information," in *Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1: Contributions to the Theory of Statistics*. University of California Press, 1961, pp. 211–252.

[18] ——, "General formulation of Shannon's main theorem in information theory," in *AMS Translations, Series 2*. AMS, 1963, vol. 33, pp. 323–438.

[19] H. G. Ding, "On the information stability of a sequence of channels," *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 258–269, 1962.

[20] ——, "On Shannon theorem and its converse for sequences of communication schemes in the case of abstract random variables," in *Transactions of the Third Prague Conference on Information Theory, Statistical Decision Functions, Random Processes (held 1962)*, 1964, pp. 285–332.

[21] S. Verdú and T. S. Han, "A general formula for channel capacity," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 1147–1157, 1994.

[22] C. E. Shannon, "A mathematical theory of communication," *Bell System Technical Journal*, vol. 27, pp. 379–423, 623–656, 1948.

[23] R. B. Ash, "Capacity and error bounds for a time-continuous Gaussian channel," *Information and Control*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 14–27, 1963.

[24] ——, "Further discussion of a time-continuous Gaussian channel," *Information and Control*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 78–83, 1964.

[25] K. Yoshihara, "Simple proofs for the strong converse theorems in some channels," *Kodai Mathematical Seminar Reports*, vol. 4, pp. 213–222, 1964.

[26] A. D. Wyner, "The capacity of the band-limited Gaussian channel," *Bell System Technical Journal*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 359–395, 1966.

[27] ——, "On the intersymbol interference problem for the Gaussian channel," *Bell System Technical Journal*, vol. 50, no. 7, pp. 2355–2363, 1971.

[28] J. L. Holsinger, "Digital communication over fixed time-continuous channels with memory — with special application to telephon channels," Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Research Laboratory of Electronics, Tech. Rep. 430, 1964.

[29] R. G. Gallager, *Information Theory and Reliable Communication*. Wiley, 1968.

[30] J. T. Cordaro and T. J. Wagner, "Intersymbol interference on a continuous-time Gaussian channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 422–429, 1970.

[31] C. R. Baker, "Capacity of the Gaussian channel without feedback," *Information and Control*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 70–89, 1978.

[32] ——, "Capacity of the mismatched Gaussian channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 802–812, 1987.

[33] ——, "Capacity of dimension-limited channels," *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 239–258, 1991.

[34] ——, "Coding capacity for a class of additive channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 233–243, 1991.

[35] I. W. McKeague, "On the capacity of channels with Gaussian and non-Gaussian noise," *Information and Control*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 153–173, 1981.

[36] C. R. Baker and S. Ihara, "Information capacity of the stationary Gaussian channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 1314–1326, 1991.

[37] S. Ihara, "Coding theorems for a continuous-time Gaussian channel with feedback," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 2041–2045, 1994.

[38] ——, "Information transmission over continuous-time Gaussian channels with feedback," *Problems of Information Transmission*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 10–24, 1999.

[39] C. D. Charalambous, A. Farhadi, and S. Z. Denic, "Control of continuous-time linear Gaussian systems over additive Gaussian wireless fading channels: A separation principle," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 1013–1019, 2008.

[40] T. Weissman, "The relationship between causal and noncausal mismatched estimation in continuous-time AWGN channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 9, pp. 4256–4273, 2010.

[41] T. Weissman, Y.-H. Kim, and H. H. Permuter, "Directed information, causal estimation, and communication in continuous time," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 1271–1287, 2013.

[42] M. V. Burnashev, "On identification capacity of infinite alphabets or continuous-time channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 2407–2414, 2000.

[43] G. Durisi, U. G. Schuster, H. Bölcskei, and S. Shamai, "Noncoherent capacity of underspread fading channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 367–395, 2010.

[44] G. Durisi, V. I. Morgenshtern, and H. Bölcskei, "On the sensitivity of continuous-time noncoherent fading channel capacity," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, no. 10, pp. 6372–6391, 2012.

[45] P. Jung, "On the Szegö-asymptotics for doubly-dispersive Gaussian channels," in *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 2011.

[46] T. Koch and A. Lapidoth, "On multipath fading channels at high SNR," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 12, pp. 5945–5957, 2010.

[47] O. Kallenberg, *Foundations of Modern Probability*, 2nd ed. Springer, 2002.

[48] R. L. Dobrushin, "General formulation of Shannon's main theorem in information theory," *Uspekhi Matematicheskih Nauk*, vol. 14, no. 6(90), pp. 3–104, 1959, (in Russian).

[49] R. L. Dobruschin, *Arbeiten zur Informationstheorie IV: Allgemeine Formulierung des Shannonschen Hauptsatzes der Informationstheorie*. Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1963.

[50] A. Feinstein, *Foundations of Information Theory*. McGraw-Hill, 1958.

[51] Y. Kakihara, *Abstract Methods in Information Theory*. World Scientific, 1999.

[52] R. M. Gray, *Entropy and Information Theory*. Springer, 2011.

[53] H. Schwarte, "On weak convergence of probability measures, channel capacity and code error probabilities," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 1549–1551, 1996.

[54] R. Ahlswede, *Storing and Transmitting Data – Rudolf Ahlswede's Lectures on Information Theory 1*, A. Ahlswede, I. Althöfer, C. Deppe, and U. Tamm, Eds. Springer, 2014.

[55] R. C. Bradley, *Introduction to Strong Mixing Conditions*. Kendrick Press, 2007, vol. 1.

[56] I. A. Ibragimov and Y. V. Linnik, *Independent and Stationary Sequences of Random Variables*. Wolters-Noordhoff, 1971.

[57] M. Mittelbach and E. A. Jorswieck, "Information regular and ψ-mixing channels," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, ISIT*, Istanbul, Turkey, 2013.

[58] R. M. Dudley, *Real Analysis and Probability*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.

[59] I. Vajda, "A synchronization method for totally ergodic channels," in *Transactions of the Fourth Prague Conference on Information Theory, Statistical Decision Functions, Random Processes (held 1965)*, 1967, pp. 611–625.

[60] J. H. B. Kemperman, "On the Shannon capacity of an arbitrary channel," *Indagationes Mathematicae*, vol. 77, no. 2, pp. 101–115, 1974.

[61] H. Schwarte, "Approaching capacity of a continuous channel by discrete input distributions," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 671–675, 1996.

[62] I. M. Gelfand, A. N. Kolmogorov, and A. M. Yaglom, "On the general definition of the quantity of information," *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*, vol. 111, no. 4, pp. 745–748, 1956, (in Russian).

[63] A. N. Shiryaev, Ed., *Selected Works of A. N. Kolmogorov: Information Theory and the Theory of Algorithms*. Kluwer Academic, 1992, vol. III.

[64] I. M. Gelfand, A. M. Jaglom, A. N. Kolmogoroff, C. Tse-Pei, and I. P. Zaregradski, *Arbeiten zur Informationstheorie II*. Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1958.

[65] M. S. Pinsker, "Information and information stability of random variables and processes," *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii, Akad. Nauk SSSR*, vol. 7, 1960, (in Russian).

[66] ——, *Information and Information Stability of Random Variables and Processes*. Holden-Day, 1964.

[67] ——, *Arbeiten zur Informationstheorie V: Information und Informationsstabilität zufälliger Größen und Prozesse*. Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1963.

[68] I. M. Gelfand and A. M. Yaglom, "Calculation of the amount of information about a random function contained in another such function," *Uspekhi Matematicheskih Nauk*, vol. 12, no. 1(73), pp. 3–52, 1957, (in Russian).

[69] ——, “Calculation of the amount of information about a random function contained in another such function,” in *AMS Translations, Series 2*. AMS, 1959, vol. 12, pp. 199–246.

[70] A. Pérez, “Notions généralisées d’incertitude, d’entropie et d’information du point de vue de la théorie de martingales,” in *Transactions of the First Prague Conference on Information Theory, Statistical Decision Functions, Random Processes (held 1956)*, 1957, pp. 183–208, (in French).

[71] A. D. Wyner, “A definition of conditional mutual information for arbitrary ensembles,” *Information and Control*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 51–59, 1978.

[72] T. T. Kadota, “On the capacity of asymptotically memoryless continuous-time channels,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 556–557, 1973.

[73] ——, “Sequential operation of communication channels and the capacity using variable-length codes,” *Journal on Applied Mathematics*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 31–47, 1978.

[74] A. Feinstein, “A new basic theorem of information theory,” *IRE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. PGIT-4, pp. 2–22, 1954.

[75] R. M. Fano, “Class notes for transmission of information, course 6.574,” Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Tech. Rep., 1952.

[76] P. Billingsley, *Ergodic Theory and Information*. Wiley, 1965.

[77] J. M. Steele, *Probability Theory and Combinatorial Optimization*. SIAM, 1997.